arXiv:1405.1478v2 [math.ST] 16 Apr 2015

Detection and Feature Selection in Sparse Mixture Models

Nicolas Verzelen* and Ery Arias-Castro†

Abstract. We consider Gaussian mixture models in high dimensions and concentrate on the twin tasks of detection and feature selection. Under sparsity assumptions on the difference in means, we derive information bounds and establish the performance of various procedures, including the top sparse eigenvalue of the sample covariance matrix and other projection tests based on moments, such as the skewness and kurtosis tests of Malkovich and Afifi (1973), and other variants which we were better able to control under the null.

Keywords: Gaussian mixture models, detection of mixtures, feature selection for mixtures, sparse mixture models, the sparse eigenvalue problem, projection tests based on moments.

1 Introduction

Feature or variable selection is a fundamental aspect of regression analysis and classification, particularly in high-dimensional settings where the number of variables exceeds the number of observations. The corresponding literature is vast, from the early proposals based on penalizing the number of variables (i.e., the ℓ_0 norm) (Akaike, 1974; Mallows, 1973; Schwarz, 1978), to the more recent variants based on convex relaxations (e.g., the ℓ_1 norm) (Candès and Tao, 2005; Chen et al., 1998; Tibshirani, 1996; Zhu and Hastie, 2004) and a wide array of alternative approaches, including non-convex relaxations (Fan and Peng, 2004), greedy methods (Mallat and Zhang, 1993; Tropp, 2004) and methods based on multiple testing (Donoho and Jin, 2009; Ingster et al., 2009; Ji and Jin, 2012; Jin, 2009). We refer the reader to (Massart, 2007) and (Hastie et al., 2009, Ch. 3, 7, 18) for additional pointers.

In contrast, variable selection in the context of clustering is at a comparatively infant stage of development, even though clustering is routinely used in high-dimensional settings. Also, according to Hastie et al. (2009):

> "Specifying an appropriate dissimilarity measure is far more important in obtaining success with clustering than choice of clustering algorithm."

And, of course, choosing a dissimilarity measure is intimately related to weighting the variables, or combinations of variables, according to their importance in clustering the observations. The literature on variable selection for clustering is indeed much more recent, scarce and ad hoc. Chang (1983) concludes empirically that performing principal component analysis as a preprocessing step to clustering a Gaussian mixture is not necessarily useful. Raftery and Dean (2006) and Maugis and Michel (2011) propose a model selection approach, while penalized methods are suggested in

*INRA, UMR 729 MISTEA, F-34060 Montpellier, FRANCE
†Department of Mathematics, University of California, San Diego, USA

(Friedman and Meulman, 2004; Pan and Shen, 2007; Wang and Zhu, 2008; Witten and Tibshirani, 2010; Xie et al., 2008).

We focus here on the emblematic setting of a mixture of two Gaussians in high-dimensions. Working under the crucial assumption that the difference in means is sparse, we study the cousin problems of mixture detection (i.e., testing whether the difference in means is zero or not) and variable selection (i.e., estimating of the support of the difference in means), both when the covariance matrix is known and when it is unknown. We obtain minimax lower bounds and propose a number of methods which are able to match these bounds.

1.1 Detection problem

The first problem that we consider is that of *detection* of mixing, specifically, we test the null hypothesis that there is only one component, versus the alternative hypothesis that there are two components, in a sample assumed to come from a Gaussian mixture model. Formally, we observe $X_1, \dots, X_n \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and consider the general testing problem

$$\begin{gathered} H_0 : X_1, \dots, X_n \overset{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(\mu, \mathbf{\Sigma}) \ , \\ \text{for some } \mu \in \mathbb{R}^p \text{ and any } \mathbf{\Sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p} \text{ psd} \ ; \end{gathered} \tag{1}$$

versus

$$\begin{gathered} H_1 : \dots, X_n \overset{\text{iid}}{\sim} \nu \mathcal{N}(\mu_0, \mathbf{\Sigma}) + (1-\nu)\mathcal{N}(\mu_1, \mathbf{\Sigma}) \ , \\ \text{for some } \mathbf{\Sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p} \text{ psd, some } \mu_0 \neq \mu_1 \in \mathbb{R}^p \text{ and some } \nu \in (0,1). \end{gathered} \tag{2}$$

(As usual, 'psd' stands for 'positive semidefinite'.) We are specifically interested in settings where the difference in means is sparse:

$$\Delta\mu := \mu_1 - \mu_0 \text{ is } s\text{-sparse.} \tag{3}$$

We say that a vector is s-sparse if it has at most s nonzero entries. where s is a fixed integer smaller or equal to p and ν belongs to $(0,1)$. In the sequel, we denote $\theta = (\nu, \mu_0, \mu_1, \mathbf{\Sigma})$ the set of parameters with the convention that under the null hypothesis $\mu_1 = \mu_0$ and $\nu \in (0,1)$ is arbitrary. Furthermore, we write $\mathbb{P}_\theta$ for the probability distribution of $X_1, \dots, X_n$.

We note that the model (1)-(2) can be written as

$$\begin{gathered} X_i = \mu_1 + \eta_i \Delta\mu + \mathbf{\Sigma}^{1/2} Z_i \ , \\ \text{where } \eta_1, \dots, \eta_n \overset{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Bern}(\nu) \text{ and independent of } Z_1, \dots, Z_n \overset{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}) \ , \end{gathered} \tag{4}$$

where $\mathbf{I}$ denotes the identity matrix (here in dimension p), and the hypothesis testing problem then reads

$$H_0 : \Delta\mu = 0 \quad \text{versus} \quad H_{1,s}^{\nu} : \Delta\mu \neq 0 \text{ is } s\text{-sparse.} \tag{5}$$

For simplicity of exposition:

- We assume that the sparsity s is known. This is a rather mild assumption (at least in theory) as discussed in Section 5.
- We assume the parameter ν is fixed. When ν approaches 0 or 1, the problem becomes that of testing for contamination. Although the two settings are intimately related, treating both would burden the presentation.

We consider the testing problem (1) vs (2) in a high-dimensional large-sample context where all the parameters (p, s, $\Delta\mu$, $\mathbf{\Sigma}$) may depend on n. Unless specified otherwise, all the limits are taken when the sample size increases to infinity, $n \to \infty$. We adopt a minimax perspective (Lehmann and Romano, 2005), which consists of quantifying the performance of tests in the worst case sense.

As various testing problems are studied in this manuscript, the notion of minimax detection rates is first introduced in an abstract way. Consider $H_0 : \theta \in \Omega_0^n$ versus $H_1 : \theta \in \Omega_1^n$ based on a sample from a distribution belonging to some family $\{\mathbb{P}_\theta : \theta \in \Omega\}$ and define a non-negative function R that satisfies $R(\theta) = 0$ for all $\theta \in \Omega_0^n$ and $R(\theta) > 0$ for all $\theta \in \Omega_1^n$. Henceforth, $R(\cdot)$ is called the signal-to-noise ratio. In our Gaussian mixture framework, think of $R(\theta)$ as some (pseudo-)norm of $\Delta\mu$. Given some number $r_n > 0$, define $\Omega_1^n(R, r_n) := \{\theta \in \Omega_1^n : \ R(\theta) \geq r_n\}$. the set of parameters in the alternative that are r_n-separated from the null hypothesis. Then, the worst-case risk of a test ϕ for testing $\theta \in \Omega_0^n$ versus $\theta \in \Omega_1^n(R, r_n)$ is the sum of its probabilities of type I and type II errors, maximized over the null set Ω_0^n and alternative distributions $\mathbb{P}_\theta$ whose signal to noise ratio is larger than r_n

$$\gamma(\phi; \Omega_0^n, \Omega_1^n(R, r_n)) = \sup_{\theta \in \Omega_0^n} \mathbb{P}_\theta(\phi = 1) + \sup_{\theta \in \Omega_1^n(R, r_n)} \mathbb{P}_\theta(\phi = 0) \ .$$

The rationale behind the introduction of r_n is that in testing problems such as (1)-(2) some distributions in the alternative are arbitrarily close to the null hypothesis so that $\gamma(\phi; \Omega_0^n, \Omega_1^n; R, 0) = 1$ for any test ϕ. This is why we rather consider the maximum of the type II errors for alternatives that are far enough from the null distribution, that is $R(\theta) \geq r_n$. Then, the minimax risk for this testing problem is defined as

$$\gamma^*(\Omega_0^n, \Omega_1^n(R, r_n)) = \inf_\phi \gamma(\phi; \Omega_0^n, \Omega_1^n(R, r_n)) \ ,$$

where the infimum is over all possible tests for H_0 versus H_1. Formally speaking, we consider a sequence of hypotheses indexed by the sample size n and, correspondingly, consider sequences of tests, also indexed by n. Understood as such, $\liminf_{n\to\infty} \gamma^*[\Omega_0^n, \Omega_1^n(R, r_n)] = 1$ is equivalent to saying that, in the large-sample limit, no test does better than random guessing. When a sequence of tests ϕ_n satisfies $\gamma(\phi_n; \Omega_0^n, \Omega_1^n(R, r_n)) \to 0$, it is said to be asymptotically powerful. A real sequence r_n^* is said to be a *minimax separation rate* of H_0 versus H_1 if for any sequence r_n satisfying $r_n \ll r_n^*$, $\gamma^*[\Omega_0^n, \Omega_1^n(R, r_n)] \to 1$, while for any sequence r_n satisfying $r_n \gg r_n^*$, $\gamma^*[\Omega_0^n, \Omega_1^n(R, r_n)] \to 0$. As we shall see in concrete situation, the minimax separation rate r_n^* characterizes the minimal distance between the mixture means to enable reliable mixture detection. As is customary, we leave the dependency on n implicit in the sequel.

Contribution. We distinguish between the cases where $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is known or unknown. The case where $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is diagonal will play a special role, due to the fact that it combines well with the assumption that the mean difference vector $\Delta\mu$ is assumed sparse in the canonical basis of $\mathbb{R}^p$. We also distinguish between the symmetric setting, where $\nu = 1/2$, and the asymmetric setting, where $\nu \neq 1/2$.

For each situation, we introduce a tailored signal to noise ratio and derive the minimax detection rate with an explicit dependency in the sample size n, the ambient dimension p, the sparsity s of the difference in means $\Delta\mu$, the mixture weight ν. We also propose some tests — some of them new — which are shown to be minimax rate optimal.

- When the covariance matrix $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is known, the test based on the top eigenvalue of the normalized sample covariance matrix is competitive when s is relatively large; while the test based on the top sparse (in the eigen-basis of $\mathbf{\Sigma}$) eigenvalue of the normalized sample covariance matrix is competitive when s is relatively small.

Table 1: Minimax detection rates and near-optimal tests as a function of s when $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is known and $p \geq n$. The minimax detection rates are expressed in terms of the signal-to-noise ratio $R_0 = \Delta\mu^\top \mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1} \Delta\mu$.

Sparsity regimes	Minimax detection rates	Near-optimal test
$s \leq \frac{n}{\log(ep/n)}$	$\sqrt{\frac{s\log(ep/s)}{n}}$	Top sparse eigenvalue (15)
$\frac{n}{\log(ep/n)} \leq s \leq \frac{\sqrt{np}}{\log(ep/n)}$	$\frac{s\log(ep/s)}{n}$	Top sparse eigenvalue (15)
$s \geq \frac{\sqrt{np}}{\log(ep/n)}$	$\sqrt{p/n}$	Top eigenvalue (14)

Table 2: Minimax detection rates and near-optimal tests when $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is unknown. The minimax detection rates are expressed in terms of the signal-to-noise $R_1 = \|\Delta\mu\|^4/\Delta\mu^\top \mathbf{\Sigma} \Delta\mu$. In this summary, we assume that $s\log(ep/s) = o(n)$. If this is not the case and $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is unknown, our lower bounds show that the problem is extremely hard.

	Minimax detection rates	Near-optimal test
symmetric ($\nu = 1/2$)	$\left[\frac{s}{n}\log\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right)\right]^{1/4}$	Projection 1st moment (27)
assymmetric ($\nu \neq 1/2$)	$\left[\frac{s}{n}\log\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right)\right]^{1/3}$	Projection 2nd signed moment (38)

- When the covariance matrix $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is unknown, we propose some new projection tests based on moments à la Malkovich and Afifi (1973), which are shown to achieve the minimax rate. The detection rates that we obtain for the projection skewness and kurtosis statistics proposed in (Malkovich and Afifi, 1973) are suboptimal.

Our results are summarized in Tables 1 and 2. Note that when $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is known, the signal-to-noise ratio is measured in terms of the Mahalanobis distance of $\Delta\mu$ from 0 — see Table 1 — while a different measure is used when $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is unknown — see Table 2. We show that using the Mahalanobis distance in the latter setting leads to exponential minimax bounds. This is detailed in Section 3.1.4.

1.2 Variable selection

The second problem that we consider is that of *variable selection*, where the goal is to estimate the support of $\Delta\mu$ in (3) under the mixture model (2). The support of a vector $v = (v_j)$ is $\{j : v_j \neq 0\}$. A problem of particular interest when s is small compared to p — meaning $s = o(p)$ — is that of estimating the support of $\Delta\mu$, which corresponds to the variables that are responsible for separating the population into two groups. This is what we mean by variable selection, and in a setting where the hypothesis testing problem is parameterized by the sample size n, we say that a certain estimator $\hat{J}_n$ is consistent for $J := \{j : \Delta\mu_j \neq 0\}$ (which may depend on n) if

$$\frac{|\hat{J}_n \triangle J|}{|J|} \to 0 \,, \quad n \to \infty \,. \tag{6}$$

The dependency on n will often be left implicit.

For the problem of variable selection, we work under the assumption that the effective dynamic range of $\Delta\mu$ and the $(2s)$-sparse Riesz constant of $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ are both bounded. We define the effective dynamic range of a set of real numbers $\{x_j\}$ (possibly organized as a vector) as $\sup_j |x_j| / \inf_{j \in J} |x_j|$, assuming $J := \{j : x_j \neq 0\} \neq \emptyset$. Given a positive semidefinite matrix $\mathbf{\Sigma} \neq 0$ of size p, and an integer $1 \leq s \leq p$, we define the largest s-sparse eigenvalue of $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ as $\lambda_s^{\max}(\mathbf{\Sigma}) = \max_u u^\top \mathbf{\Sigma} u$, where the maximum is over s-sparse unit vectors $u \in \mathbb{R}^p$. The smallest s-sparse eigenvalue of $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is defined analogously, replacing 'max' with 'min'. The s-sparse Riesz constant of $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is simply $\lambda_s^{\max}(\mathbf{\Sigma})/\lambda_s^{\min}(\mathbf{\Sigma})$. Equivalently, it is the supremum of $u^\top \mathbf{\Sigma} u / v^\top \mathbf{\Sigma} v$ over all pairs of unit s-sparse vectors u and v.

Contribution. Since in each case our testing procedure in the sparse setting ($s = o(p)$) is based on maximizing some form of moment over direction vectors which are sparse (in some way made explicit later on), it is natural to use the support of the maximizing direction as an estimator for the support of $\Delta\mu$:

- When $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is known, we show that this is estimator is indeed consistent in the sense of (6) at (essentially) the minimax rate for detection.
- When $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is unknown, surprisingly, this estimator may be suboptimal. This leads us to propose nontrivial variants in (31) (symmetric setting) and (40) (asymmetric setting). We are able to show that the support estimator (31) is consistent (essentially) at the minimax rate for detection.

1.3 Consequences for clustering

We see the problems of detection and variable selection as complementary to the problem of clustering. We could imagine a work flow where detection is performed first, then variable selection if the test is significant, and then clustering based on the selected variables. To keep this paper concise, we do not provide here an analysis of these multi-step clustering algorithms. See (Azizyan et al., 2013, 2014; Jin and Wang, 2014) for recent results in this direction.

The motivation for performing detection and variable selection first is meaningful because these can be successfully accomplished with a much smaller separation between the components than clustering. Indeed, consider a Gaussian mixture of the form $\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{\Sigma}) + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{N}(\Delta\mu, \mathbf{\Sigma})$. Even if $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ and $\Delta\mu$ are known — in which case the best clustering method is the rule $\{x^\top \mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1}\Delta\mu > \Delta\mu^\top \mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1}\Delta\mu/2\}$ — the expected clustering error is at least $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{N}(0,1) > \|\mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1/2}\Delta\mu\|/2)$, which converges to 0 only if $\|\mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1/2}\Delta\mu\| \to \infty$.

1.4 Methodology, computational issues, and mathematical technique

Methodology. Most of the tests that we propose are novel. While the first test in Table 1 is very natural, the second test is new. It is a close (but nontrivial) cousin of the sparse eigenvalue (19), considered in the sparse PCA literature (see Section 1.5). However, the latter appears suboptimal so that our variant brings a nontrivial improvement. The tests in Table 2 are both new. They compete with the projection kurtosis (25) and skewness (36) that we adapted from the normality tests of Malkovich and Afifi (1973). The motivation for introducing these new tests is our inability to prove that the corresponding classical tests achieve the minimax rate. This is because they are based on higher-order moments, which we found harder to control under the null.

Computational issues. We emphasize that except for the top eigenvalue, the other test statistics in Tables 1 and 2 are very hard to compute even for moderate p. We conjecture that no testing

Table 3: Detection rates achieved by some computationally feasible tests when $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is unknown. See Section 4 for precise statements and assumptions. Compared to Table 1, the rates are at most $\sqrt{s}$ slower than the optimal rates.

Sparsity regimes	Detection rates	Test
$s \leq \sqrt{p/\log(p)}$	$\sqrt{s^2 \frac{\log(p)}{n}}$	Maximal canonical variance (47)
$s \geq \sqrt{p/\log(p)}$	$\sqrt{p/n}$	Top eigenvalue (14)

Table 4: Detection rates achieved by some computationally feasible tests when $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is unknown. See Section 4 for precise statements and assumptions. Compared to Table 2, the rates are respectively at most $s^{1/4}$ and $s^{1/3}$ slower than the optimal rates. In this summary, we assume that $\log(p) = o(n)$.

Setting	Detection rates	Test
Symmetric ($\nu = 1/2$)	$\left[\frac{s^4}{n} \log\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right)\right]^{1/4}$	Coordinatewise 1st moment (50)
Assymmetric ($\nu \neq 1/2$)	$\left[\frac{s^3}{n} \log\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right)\right]^{1/3}$	Coordinatewise 2nd signed moment (51)

procedure with polynomial computational complexity is able to achieve the minimax rates of detection. When the covariance $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is know, our testing problem shares many similarities with the sparse PCA detection problem for which a gap between optimal and computationally amenable procedures has been established.

Another contribution of this paper is to propose computationally feasible tests:

- We study coordinate-wise methods based on moments.
- We study already-existing convex relaxations to the sparse eigenvalue problem.

See Tables 3 and 4. The tests in Table 4 are new and are the coordinate-wise equivalents of the tests appearing in Table 2.

A note on the mathematical technicalities. Regarding the technical arguments, the derivation of the information lower bounds for the detection problem is standard: we reduce the set of null hypotheses to the standard normal distribution and put a prior on the set of alternatives, and then bound the variance of the resulting likelihood ratio under the null. The latter amounts to bounding the chi-squared divergence between the reduced null and alternative distributions; see (Tsybakov, 2009, Th. 2.2). That said, in the details, the calculations are both complicated and tedious. The test statistics that we study are based on sample moments of Gaussian random variables of degree up to 4. To control these statistics under the null, we use a combination of chaining à la Dudley (van der Vaart and Wellner, 1996) and concentration bounds that we derive based on approximations of Gaussian random variables by sums of Rademacher random variables and the concentration bounds for these obtained by Boucheron et al. (2005).

1.5 Closely related literature

We already cited a number of publications proposing various methods for variable selection in the context of high-dimensional clustering. None of these papers offers any real theoretical insights on the difficulty of this problem. In fact, very few mathematical results are available in this area.

Most of them are on the estimation of Gaussian mixture parameters. Recent papers in this line include (Belkin and Sinha, 2010; Brubaker and Vempala, 2008; Hsu and Kakade, 2013; Kalai et al., 2012), and references therein. These papers focus on designing polynomial time algorithms that work when there is sufficient parameter identifiability, which is often not optimized. An exception to that is (Chaudhuri et al., 2009), where a multistage variant of k-means is analyzed in the canonical setting of a symmetric mixture of two Gaussians with identity covariance, and showed to match an information-theoretic bound when the centers are at a distance exceeding 1. We note that there is no assumption of sparsity made in this literature.

Related to our proposal of coordinate-wise methods presented in Section 4.1, Chan and Hall (2010) test each coordinate for unimodality and prove variable selection consistency in a nonparametric setting. Similar in spirit, Jin and Wang (2014) propose[1] the selection of features based on coordinate-wise Kolmogorov-Smirnov goodness-of-fit testing. Their setting is slightly different from ours as the number of mixtures in their paper is allowed to be larger than 2 but the covariance matrix is restricted to be diagonal and the distributions are supposed to be assymmetric. Nevertheless, when specialized to a common framework (two components, diagonal unknown covariance matrix, $\nu \neq 1/2$), their detection rates and ours are the same.

More closely related to what we do here, Azizyan et al. (2013) consider the task of clustering a sparse symmetric mixture of two Gaussians in high-dimensions with identity covariance matrix. They prove a minimax lower bound for some clustering error, but do not exhibit any method that matches that lower bound. Instead, they also propose a coordinate-wise approach which is almost identical to one of the methods considered by (Amini and Wainwright, 2009) (see below) and is very similar to what we do in Section 4.1. This work is closely related to what we obtain in Section 2 (specialized to $\mathbf{\Sigma} = \mathbf{I}$) and in Section 4.1. The same authors propose[1] in (Azizyan et al., 2014) a combination of learning the parameters of the Gaussian mixture model using (Hardt and Price, 2014) and then applying sparse linear discriminant analysis, but their results are not directly comparable to our as they assume that $\mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1}\Delta\mu$ (instead of $\Delta\mu$) is sparse.

In fact, closest to our work is the recent literature on sparse principal component analysis. This is particularly natural in view of the following expression for the covariance matrix:

$$\mathrm{Cov}(X) = \nu(1-\nu)\Delta\mu\Delta\mu^\top + \mathbf{\Sigma}\ . \tag{7}$$

The difference is that, in this line of work, $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ are iid centered normal with covariance matrix of the form (7). We note that most of the work considers the case where $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is known and isotropic. The most closely related is the work of Berthet and Rigollet (2013b) on testing for a leading sparse principal direction. From them we drew the idea of using the SDP relaxation of d'Aspremont et al. (2007) for the sparse eigenvalue problem; see Section 4.2. Also closely related is (Amini and Wainwright, 2009), where the authors tackle the problem of variable selection in the same context. They propose a coordinate-wise approach which selects the coordinates corresponding to the top s largest variances, identical to a preprocessing step in (Johnstone and Lu, 2009). They also study the SDP method of d'Aspremont et al. (2007), but under very strong constraints — in particular, they assume that $s = O(\log p)$. The estimation of the leading principal component(s), which concerns for example (Birnbaum et al., 2013; Cai et al., 2013a,b; Johnstone and Lu, 2009; Vu and Lei, 2012, 2013), is also closely related.

[1] This work appeared after the initial version of the present paper was made publicly available.

Remark. We note that most of the references in the sparse PCA literature assume that $\mathbf{\Sigma} = \mathbf{I}$ in (7). This can easily be extended to the case of a diagonal covariance matrix, which is also an important case in our work. That said, it is important to realize that, even when more general covariance structures are considered — as in (Vu and Lei, 2012, 2013) — the parallel with our work is essentially restricted to the case where the covariance matrix is known. Indeed, once the covariance matrix is unknown, looking for unusually large eigenvalues in the (sample) covariance matrix becomes meaningless for the problem of clustering.

1.6 Organization and notation

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we consider the case where the covariance is known. In Section 3, we treat the case where covariance is unknown, including the special case where it is known to be diagonal. In Section 4 we suggest and study coordinate-wise methods and some relaxations. We then compare some of them in small numerical experiments. We discuss extensions and important issues in Section 5, such as the case of unknown sparsity, the case of mixture models with different covariances, the case of mixtures with more than two components, and more. The proofs are deferred to Sections 6 (lower bounds) and 7 (upper bounds).

Notation. For an integer p, $[p] = \{1, \dots, p\}$. For a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{p\times p}$ and a subset $S \subset [p]$, A_S denotes the principal submatrix of A indexed by S. Throughout, p will denote the ambient dimension. For a finite set S, let $|S|$ denote its size (aka cardinality). For two vectors $u = (u_j)$ and $v = (v_j)$ in a Euclidean space, $\|u\|$ denotes the Euclidean norm, $\langle u, v\rangle$ the inner product, $\|u\|_\infty = \max_j |u_j|$ the supnorm, and $\|u\|_0$ the cardinality of the support $\mathrm{supp}(u) := \{j : u_j \neq 0\}$. Finally, C, C_1, C_2, etc, will denote positive constants that may change with each appearance.

2 Known covariance matrix

In this section, the covariance $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is assumed to be known. The minimax detection rates are expressed with respect to the Mahalanobis distance

$$R_0(\theta) = \Delta\mu^\top \mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1} \Delta\mu \ .$$

2.1 Minimax lower bound

Fix a mixing weight $\nu \in (0, 1)$ and a sparsity s, and consider

$$\Omega_0 = \big\{\theta = (\nu, \mu, \mu, \mathbf{\Sigma}),\ \mu \in \mathbb{R}^p,\ \mathbf{\Sigma} \text{ psd}\big\}, \tag{8}$$

and, for $r_n > 0$,

$$\Omega_1(\nu, R, r_n) := \big\{\theta = (\nu, \mu_0, \mu_1, \mathbf{\Sigma}) : \mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathbb{R}^p \text{ satisfying (3)}, \mathbf{\Sigma} \text{ psd and } R(\theta) \geq r_n\big\}, \tag{9}$$

where we leave implicit the dependency of $\Omega_1(\nu, R_0, r_n)$ on s. As the tests considered in this section use the knowledge the covariance matrix $\mathbf{\Sigma}$, we also consider for any covariance $\mathbf{\Sigma}$,

$$\Omega_0(\mathbf{\Sigma}) = \big\{\theta = (\nu, \mu, \mu, \mathbf{\Sigma}),\ \mu \in \mathbb{R}^p\big\}, \tag{10}$$

and, fixing a mixing weight $\nu \in (0, 1)$, a sparsity s and $r_n > 0$, consider

$$\Omega_1(\nu, \mathbf{\Sigma}, R, r_n) := \big\{\theta = (\nu, \mu_0, \mu_1, \mathbf{\Sigma}) : \mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathbb{R}^p \text{ satisfying (3)}, \text{ and } R(\theta) \geq r_n\big\} \ . \tag{11}$$

Then, the minimax detection risk with known variance is defined by

$$\gamma^{*,V}(\Omega_0, \Omega_1(\nu, R, r_n)) = \sup_{\mathbf{\Sigma}} \inf_{\phi} \gamma(\phi; \Omega_0(\mathbf{\Sigma}), \Omega_1(\nu, \mathbf{\Sigma}, R, r_n)) \ .$$

In order to emphasize the role of sparsity, we distinguish the sparse and non-sparse settings, corresponding to $s = p$ and $s = o(p)$, respectively.

Proposition 1. *Consider testing (10) versus (11) where the covariance $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is known. For any fixed $\nu \in (0,1)$, we have $\liminf \gamma^{*,V}(\Omega_0, \Omega_1(\nu, R_0, r_n)) = 1$ in the following two cases:*

- Non-sparse setting. *Assume $s = p \to \infty$ and*

$$r_n \ll \sqrt{p/n} \ .$$

- Sparse setting. *Assume $p/s \to \infty$ and*

$$r_n \ll \sqrt{p/n} \tag{12}$$

and

$$\limsup \frac{r_n}{\sqrt{\frac{s}{n}\log(\frac{ep}{s}) \vee \frac{s}{n}\log(\frac{ep}{s})}} < 1 \ . \tag{13}$$

Remark. As usual for minimax lower bounds, it is sufficient to provide a lower bound on the risk for testing subclasses of Ω_0 and $\Omega_1(\nu, R_0, r_n)$. In fact, we reduce the problem to testing $\theta \in \widetilde{\Omega}_0 := \{\theta = (\nu, 0, 0, \mathbf{I})\}$ against $\theta \in \widetilde{\Omega}_1(\nu, R_0, r_n) := \{(\nu, -(1-\nu)\mu, \nu\mu, \mathbf{I}),\ \mu \text{ is } s\text{-sparse and } R_0(\theta) \geq r_n\}$. See the proof for more details.

2.2 Methodology based on (sparse) principal component analysis

We now turn to designing tests that are asymptotically powerful just above the lower bound given in Proposition 1. We note that the performance bounds for the tests based on (14) and (15) in Propositions 2 and 3 apply to a general (known) covariance matrix.

Our methodology is based on the expression for the covariance matrix of X displayed in (7). We standardize the observations to have identity covariance under the null, thus working with $X_\ddagger = \mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1/2}X$, which satisfies

$$\mathbf{\Sigma}_\ddagger := \mathrm{Cov}(X_\ddagger) = \mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1/2}\,\mathrm{Cov}(X)\mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1/2} = \nu(1-\nu)\Delta\mu_\ddagger\Delta\mu_\ddagger^\top + \mathbf{I} \ ,$$

where $\Delta\mu_\ddagger := \mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1/2}\Delta\mu$. Thus $\mathrm{Cov}(X_\ddagger)$ is a rank-one perturbation of the identity matrix under the alternative. Since $\mathrm{Cov}(X_\ddagger)$ is unknown, our inference is based on the sample equivalent, which is $\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_\ddagger := \mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1/2}\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}\mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1/2}$, where

$$\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}} := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})(X_i - \bar{X})^\top, \quad \bar{X} := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n X_i \ ,$$

are the sample covariance and sample mean, respectively.

- When $\Delta\mu$ is not sparse ($s = p$), this leads us to consider the top eigenvalue of $\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_\ddagger$, namely

$$\hat{\lambda}_{\mathbf{\Sigma}}^{\max} := \max_{\|u\|=1} u^\top \hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_\ddagger u \ . \tag{14}$$

  We note that the maximizer of (14) is the first principal direction of the standardized observations, and that $\hat{\lambda}_{\mathbf{\Sigma}}^{\max}$ is the variance of along that direction. As we shall see, this test is also competitive when $\Delta\mu$ is moderately sparse.

- When $\Delta\mu$ is s-sparse, we restrict the maximization over the set of vectors that are s-sparse in some appropriate basis. To guide our choice, we notice that $\Delta\mu_\ddagger$ is a top eigenvector for $\mathbf{\Sigma}_\ddagger$, and $\mathbf{\Sigma}^{1/2}\Delta\mu_\ddagger = \Delta\mu$ is s-sparse. This leads us to the following form of s-sparse (top) eigenvalue

$$\hat{\lambda}^{\max}_{s,\mathbf{\Sigma}} := \max_{\|u\|=1,\, \|\mathbf{\Sigma}^{1/2}u\|_0 \le s} u^\top \hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_\ddagger u \ . \tag{15}$$

  We note that the maximizer of (15) is the first s-sparse (after standardization) principal direction of the standardized observations, and that $\hat{\lambda}^{\max}_{s,\mathbf{\Sigma}}$ is the variance of along that direction.

The following performance bound says, roughly, that the test based on (14) is able to reliably detect when (12) does not hold.

Proposition 2. *Consider testing (10) versus (11) with $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ known, $\nu \in (0,1)$ fixed, $s = p$, and $p \wedge n \to \infty$. Let T denote the statistic (14). The test $\phi = \{T \ge 1 + p/n + 12\sqrt{p/n}\}$ is asymptotically powerful, meaning $\gamma(\phi; \Omega_0(\mathbf{\Sigma}), \Omega_1(\nu, \mathbf{\Sigma}, R_0, r_n)) \to 0$, if the minimum Mahalanobis distance r_n satisfies*

$$\liminf r_n \nu(1-\nu)\sqrt{\frac{n}{p}} \ge C \ , \tag{16}$$

where C is a universal constant.

By a simple inclusion argument, this also implies $\gamma(\phi; \Omega_0(\mathbf{\Sigma}), \Omega_1(\nu, \mathbf{\Sigma}, R_0, r_n)) \to 0$ for any $s \le p$. In view of Proposition 1, the above test is also adaptive to the mixing weight ν as long as it is fixed.

Remark. With the notable exception of (14), all the statistics studied in Sections 2 and 3 are difficult to compute, which effectively makes them useless in practical settings, which are often high-dimensional. For this reason, we leave implicit the critical values of the corresponding tests. The interested reader may obtain their expression by inspecting the proofs of the corresponding propositions. The following performance bound says, roughly, that the test based on (15) is able to reliably detect when (13) does not hold, and that consistent support estimation is possible with a slightly stronger signal-to-noise ratio. The procedure is also adaptive to ν.

Proposition 3. *Assume $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is known and $p \wedge n \to \infty$. For any sequence s of sparsity, the following results holds.*

- Detection. *Consider testing (10) versus (11) with $\nu \in (0,1)$ fixed. Let T_s denote the statistic (15). There is a sequence of critical values t such that the test $\phi = \{T_s \ge t\}$ is asymptotically powerful, meaning $\gamma(\phi; \Omega_0(\mathbf{\Sigma}), \Omega_1(\nu, \mathbf{\Sigma}, R_0, r_n)) \to 0$, if the minimum Mahalanobis distance r_n satisfies*

$$\liminf \frac{\nu(1-\nu) r_n}{\sqrt{\frac{s}{n}\log(\frac{ep}{s})} \vee \frac{s}{n}\log(\frac{ep}{s})} > C \ , \tag{17}$$

  where C is a universal constant.

- Variable selection. *Consider the model (11). Let $\hat{u}_s$ denote a maximizer of (15) and let $\hat{v}_s = \mathbf{\Sigma}^{1/2}\hat{u}_s$. Then under the stronger condition that*

$$\nu(1-\nu)R_0(\theta) = \nu(1-\nu)\Delta\mu^\top \mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1}\Delta\mu \gg \sqrt{\frac{s}{n}\log(\tfrac{ep}{s})} \vee \frac{s}{n}\log(\tfrac{ep}{s}) \ , \tag{18}$$

  and assuming that the effective dynamic range of $\Delta\mu$ and the $(2s)$-sparse Riesz constant of $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ are both bounded, the support of $\hat{v}_s$ is consistent for the support of $\Delta\mu$.

We note that without a bound on the dynamic range of $\Delta\mu$, its largest entries could overwhelm the smaller (nonzero) ones and make consistent support recovery difficult, or even impossible.

Special case: $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \mathbf{I}$. In the isotropic setting, the detection boundary is roughly at

$$\|\Delta\mu\|^2 \approx \sqrt{\frac{s}{n}\log(\tfrac{ep}{s})} \vee \frac{s}{n}\log(\tfrac{ep}{s}) \ ,$$

and the statistic of choice (15) is the top s-sparse eigenvalue of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}$, which is also shown to be rate-optimal by Berthet and Rigollet (2013b) for the problem of testing for a top principal direction in a spiked Gaussian covariance model.

Remark. In general, the statistic defined in (15) is not the top s-sparse eigenvalue of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\ddagger$, which is instead defined as

$$\lambda_s^{\max}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\ddagger) = \max_{\|u\|=1,\, \|u\|_0 \le s} u^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\ddagger u \ . \tag{19}$$

We are only able to show that the statistic (19) is asymptotically powerful in the following sense, that $\gamma(\phi; \Omega_0(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}), \Omega_1(\nu, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}, R_1, r_n)) \to 0$ for $R_1(\theta) = \nu(1-\nu)\|\Delta\mu\|^4/\Delta\mu^\top\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\Delta\mu$ and r_n satisfying (17) for some constant $C > 0$. However, this bound is weaker than what we obtain in Proposition 3 for (15), simply because the function $R_1(\theta)$ is smaller than the Mahalanobis distance $R_0(\theta)$. Indeed, using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$\|\Delta\mu\|^4 = \big[(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1/2}\Delta\mu)^\top(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2}\Delta\mu)\big]^2 \le \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1/2}\Delta\mu\|^2\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2}\Delta\mu\|^2 = (\Delta\mu^\top\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}\Delta\mu)(\Delta\mu^\top\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\Delta\mu) \ .$$

3 Unknown covariance matrix

We distinguish between the symmetric case where $\nu = 1/2$, and the asymmetric case where $\nu \neq 1/2$. In terms of methodology, skewness and kurtosis tests have played a major role in testing for multivariate normality, at least since the seminal work of Mardia (1970). Some of these tests are based on estimating the covariance matrix, and therefore are not applicable in high-dimensional settings where $p > n$, at least not without additional assumptions on the covariance matrix. More malleable approaches are projection tests such as those proposed by Malkovich and Afifi (1973). We study such tests and design new variants to palliate some deficiencies.

3.1 Symmetric setting

Consider the case where the covariance matrix is unknown and where the mixture distribution is symmetric, meaning that $\nu = 1/2$. The resulting mixture testing problem is more difficult than in the asymmetric setting treated in Section 3.2.

3.1.1 Minimax lower bound

We start with a minimax lower bound with respect to the signal to noise ratio

$$R_1(\theta) = \frac{\|\Delta\mu\|^4}{\Delta\mu^\top\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\Delta\mu} \ , \tag{20}$$

as the minimax detection rate with respect to the Mahalanobis distance R_0 is degenerate in a sparse high-dimensional setting (see Proposition 8 below).

Proposition 4. *Consider testing (8) versus (9) with $\nu = 1/2$. Then $\liminf \gamma^*(\Omega_0, \Omega_1(\nu, R_1, r_n)) = 1$ in the following cases:*

- Non-sparse setting. *Assume* $s = p \to \infty$ *and*

$$r_n \ll (p/n)^{1/4} \; ; \tag{21}$$

or, assume $p \gg n$ *and*

$$\limsup r_n e^{-Cp/n} < 1 \; , \tag{22}$$

where $C > 0$ *is a universal constant.*

- Sparse setting. *Assume* $p/s \to \infty$ *and*

$$\limsup r_n \left[\frac{s}{n} \log\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right)\right]^{-1/4} \leq C_1 \; , \tag{23}$$

where $C_1 > 0$ *is a universal constant; or, assume* $n \leq \frac{1}{C_2} s \log(ep/s)$ *and*

$$\limsup r_n e^{-C_3 \frac{s}{n} \log\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right)} \leq 1 \; , \tag{24}$$

where $C_2, C_3 > 0$ *are universal constants.*

Remark: From the above proposition, we deduce that the testing problem becomes extremely difficult when $\zeta := s \log(ep/s)/n \to \infty$, in the sense that the minimax detection rate is at least exponentially large with respect to ζ. A similar phenomenon occurs in other detection problems such as in sparse linear regression (Verzelen, 2012).

Remark: Similar to what we do in the proof of Proposition 1, we reduce to testing subclasses of hypotheses. Specifically, we reduce to testing In fact, we reduce the problem to testing $\theta \in \widetilde{\Omega}_0 := \left\{\theta = (\frac{1}{2}, 0, 0, \mathbf{I})\right\}$ against

$$\theta \in \widetilde{\Omega}_1(\tfrac{1}{2}, R_1, r_n) := \left\{(\tfrac{1}{2}, -\tfrac{1}{2}\mu, \tfrac{1}{2}\mu, \mathbf{\Sigma}_\mu), \;\; \mu \text{ is } s\text{-sparse and } R_1(\theta) \geq r_n\right\} \; ,$$

where $\mathbf{\Sigma}_\mu := \mathbf{I} - \frac{1}{4}\Delta\mu\Delta\mu^\top$. Note that, in this testing problem, the variables are centered and $\mathrm{Cov}(X) = \mathbf{I}$, both under the null and under the alternative.

3.1.2 A classical approach based on the kurtosis

Contrary to the previous section, the covariance matrix $\mathrm{Cov}\,(X)$ does not bring in any sensible information to distinguish the null hypothesis from the alternative. It is therefore natural to consider higher order moments of X. In the symmetric setting, a traditional approach is the use of a kurtosis test. Malkovich and Afifi (1973) propose a projection test based on the kurtosis for the problem of testing for multivariate normality. This is easily adapted to the sparse setting. The resulting test is based on rejecting for *small* values of

$$\min_{\|u\|_0 \leq s} \frac{\sum_i \left[u^\top (X_i - \bar{X})\right]^4}{\left(\sum_i \left[u^\top (X_i - \bar{X})\right]^2\right)^2} \; . \tag{25}$$

We note that Malkovich and Afifi (1973) — who are interested in testing for multivariate normality and do not make sparsity assumptions — reject for unusually large or small values of the above ratio along a general (meaning, not necessarily sparse) direction u.

Remark. Although the null distribution of (25) depends on the unknown covariance matrix $\mathbf{\Sigma}$, it can calibrated by a simple Bonferroni correction, which is possible because (25) is the minimum over all subsets $S \subset [p]$ of size s of variables which have a null distribution that is independent of $\mathbf{\Sigma}$. The same applies to (27), (36) and (38).

Proposition 5. *Consider testing (8) versus (9) with the assumption $|\nu - 1/2| < \frac{\sqrt{3}}{6}$, and assume that $n \gg [s\log(ep/s)]^2$. Let T denote the statistic (25). There is a sequence of critical values t such that such the test $\phi = \{T \le t\}$ is asymptotically powerful, meaning $\gamma(\phi; \Omega_0, \Omega_1(\nu, R_1, r_n)) \to 0$, if*

$$r_n \gg \Big[\frac{s}{n}\log\Big(\frac{ep}{s}\Big)\Big]^{1/4} \vee \Big[\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}}\log\Big(\frac{ep}{s}\Big)\Big] \,. \tag{26}$$

We see that there is a substantial discrepancy between the performance that we establish for the sparse kurtosis test (25) in Proposition 5 and the lower bound obtained in Proposition 4. The issue comes from the control of the numerator in (25), in that the fourth moment estimator has a heavy tail and does not concentrate enough when $s\log(ep/s)$ is too large.

3.1.3 A new approach based on the first absolute moment

Instead of a kurtosis test, which is based on the fourth central moment, we propose a test based on the first central absolute moment in order to palliate the aforementioned issues. The test rejects for large values of

$$\max_{\|u\|_0 \le s} \frac{\sum_i \big|u^\top (X_i - \bar{X})\big|}{\Big(\sum_i \big[u^\top (X_i - \bar{X})\big]^2\Big)^{1/2}}. \tag{27}$$

Proposition 6. *Consider testing (8) versus (9) with the assumption $|\nu - 1/2| < \frac{1}{6}$, and assume that $n \gg s\log(ep/s)$. Let T denote the statistic (27). There is a sequence of critical values t such that the test $\phi = \{T \ge t\}$ is asymptotically powerful, meaning $\gamma(\phi; \Omega_0, \Omega_1(\nu, R_1, r_n)) \to 0$, if*

$$r_n \gg \Big[\frac{s}{n}\log(ep/s)\Big]^{1/4}. \tag{28}$$

Consequently, the test based on (27) achieves the minimax detection boundaries (21) and (23). Note that the assumption $n \gg s\log(ep/s)$ is necessary in view of Proposition 4.

Variable selection. In regards to variable selection, we are unable to use the statistic (27) (or the original statistic (25)) to perform variable selection. To see why, for concreteness, consider the situation where the variables have zero mean under the null and alternative, and assume the mixture is symmetric ($\nu = 1/2$). Using the arguments provided in the proof of Proposition 6, we can show that, if $n \to \infty$ fast enough, then the result of maximizing of the empirical ratio in (27) is consistent with

$$\max_{\|u\|_0 \le s} \frac{\mathbb{E}\big|u^\top X\big|}{\Big(\mathbb{E}\big[u^\top X\big]^2\Big)^{1/2}} \,. \tag{29}$$

Elementary calculations yield

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}\big|u^\top X\big|}{\Big(\mathbb{E}\big[u^\top X\big]^2\Big)^{1/2}} = \frac{\mathbb{E}\big|h_u/2 + z\big|}{(1 + h_u^2/4)^{1/2}} = \sqrt{\tfrac{2}{\pi}}\big(1 + \tfrac{1}{192}h_u^4 + O(h_u^6)\big) \,, \tag{30}$$

where $z \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)$ and when $h_u := u^\top \Delta\mu / \sqrt{u^\top \mathbf{\Sigma} u} \to 0$, which is allowed in (28). The maximizer of (29) is therefore close to $\arg\max_{\|u\|_0 \le s} |h_u|$, which does not necessarily have the same support as $\Delta\mu$.

In view of (30), we normalize (27) to cancel the denominator $(u^\top \mathbf{\Sigma} u)^2$ in h_u^4, so that the maximizer is approximately aligned with $\Delta\mu$. This motivates us to consider the support estimator $\hat{J} = \mathrm{supp}(\hat{u})$, where

$$\hat{u} \in \arg \max_{\|u\|_0 \leq s, \|u\|=1} \left[\frac{\sum_i \left| u^\top (X_i - \bar{X}) \right|}{\left(\sum_i \left[u^\top (X_i - \bar{X}) \right]^2 \right)^{1/2}} - \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \right] \left(\sum_i \left[u^\top (X_i - \bar{X}) \right]^2 \right)^2 . \tag{31}$$

Proposition 7. *Consider the model (11) with the assumption $|\nu - 1/2| < \frac{1}{6}$, assume that $n \gg s \log(ep/s)$ and that $\Delta\mu$ is s-sparse. Then the estimator defined in (31) is consistent for the support of $\Delta\mu$ if*

$$1 \gg \frac{\|\Delta\mu\|^4}{\Delta\mu^\top \mathbf{\Sigma} \Delta\mu} \gg \left[\frac{s}{n} \log\left(\frac{ep}{s} \right) \right]^{1/4} , \tag{32}$$

and the effective dynamic range of $\Delta\mu$ and the $(2s)$-sparse Riesz constant of $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ are both bounded.

Consequently, the estimator (31) consistency selects the variables when the signal strength is just above the detection threshold. When the signal is strong, the procedure above seems to fail. However, we mention that the simpler support estimator based on

$$\hat{u} \in \operatorname*{arg\,max}_{\|u\|_0 \leq s, \|u\|=1} \sum_i \left| u^\top (X_i - \bar{X}) \right| ,$$

is consistent when $\|\Delta\mu\|^4 / \Delta\mu^\top \mathbf{\Sigma} \Delta\mu \to \infty$ under the same conditions otherwise. Details are omitted as the arguments are similar, but simpler, than those justifying Proposition 7. Compare also with the coordinate-wise support estimator introduced in Section 4.1.2.

3.1.4 The Mahalanobis metric

The lower bounds obtained in Proposition 4 are in terms of R_1, while those we obtained for the case where the covariance matrix is known in Proposition 1 are in terms of the Mahalanobis metric R_0. While these two metrics are equivalent if the s-sparse Riesz constant of $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is bounded, this is not so for any arbitrary $\mathbf{\Sigma}$. We state below an information bound in terms of the Mahalanobis distance that is exponential in p/n, even when $\Delta\mu$ is 1-sparse. This suggests that R_1 is more relevant than R_0 in a sparse high-dimensional setting.

Proposition 8. *If $p \gg n$, then $\liminf \gamma^*(\Omega_0, \Omega_1(\nu, R_0, r_n)) = 1$ when*

$$\Delta\mu^\top \mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1} \Delta\mu \ll \frac{e^{p/(2n)}}{np} . \tag{33}$$

Again, the lower bound is proved by a reduction to the following (much) simpler testing problem. Fix a 1-sparse vector $\Delta\mu$, and consider $\theta \in \Omega_0^\ddagger := \left\{ (\frac{1}{2}, 0, 0, \mathbf{I}) \right\}$ against

$$\theta \in \Omega_1^\ddagger(\tfrac{1}{2}, R_0, r_n) := \left\{ (\tfrac{1}{2}, -\tfrac{1}{2}\Delta\mu, \tfrac{1}{2}\Delta\mu, \mathbf{\Sigma}),\ \mathbf{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I} \text{ has rank 1 and } R_0(\theta) \geq r_n \right\} .$$

3.2 Asymmetric setting

Consider the case where the covariance matrix is unknown and where the mixture distribution is asymmetric, meaning that $\nu \neq 1/2$. As we shall see, detection in the asymmetric setting is quantifiably easier than in the symmetric setting, due to the ability to test for asymmetry (in a particular manner).

3.2.1 Minimax lower bound

We start with a minimax lower bound. As in the symmetric setting covered in Section 3.1, we use the pseudo-metric R_1 defined in (20).

Proposition 9. *Consider testing* (8) *versus* (9) *with* $\nu \neq 1/2$ *fixed. Then* $\liminf \gamma^*(\Omega_0, \Omega_1(\nu, R_1, r_n)) = 1$ *in the following cases:*

- Non-sparse setting. *Assume* $s = p \to \infty$ *and* $p = o(n)$ *and*

$$r_n \ll (p/n)^{1/3} \ . \tag{34}$$

- Sparse setting. *Assume* $p/s \to \infty$ *and* $n \gg s \log(ep/s)$ *and*

$$\limsup r_n \left[\frac{s}{n} \log\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right)\right]^{-1/3} \leq C_\nu \ , \tag{35}$$

  where $C_\nu > 0$ *is a constant.*

3.2.2 A classical approach based on the skewness

The classical approach in this asymmetric setting is a skewness test. We adapt the projection test of Malkovich and Afifi (1973) to our sparse setting. This leads us to rejecting for large values of the following statistic:

$$\max_{\|u\|_0 \leq s} \frac{\sum_i \left[u^\top (X_i - \bar{X})\right]^3}{\left(\sum_i \left[u^\top (X_i - \bar{X})\right]^2\right)^{3/2}}. \tag{36}$$

Once again, we note that Malkovich and Afifi (1973) — who are interested in testing for multivariate normality and do not make sparsity assumptions — reject for unusually large or small values of the above ratio along a general (meaning, not necessarily sparse) direction u.

Proposition 10. *Consider testing* (8) *versus* (9) *with the assumption* $\nu \neq 1/2$ *fixed, and* $n \gg s \log(ep/s)$. *Let* T *denote the statistic* (36). *There is a sequence of critical values* t *such that the test* $\phi = \{T \geq t\}$ *is asymptotically powerful, meaning* $\gamma(\phi; \Omega_0, \Omega_1(\nu, R_1, r_n)) \to 0$, *if*

$$\big(\nu(1-\nu)|1-2\nu|\big)^{2/3} r_n \gg \left[\frac{s}{n}\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right)\right]^{1/3} \vee \left[n^{1/3}\frac{s}{n}\log(ep/s)\right]. \tag{37}$$

We notice a substantial discrepancy between this rate and the lower bound obtained in Proposition 9. As with the kurtosis statistic, the main issue is our difficulty with proving that the third moment concentrates enough under the null.

3.2.3 A new approach based on the signed second moment

We replace the third moment with the second signed moment, leading to

$$\max_{\|u\|_0 \leq s} \frac{\sum_i \left[u^\top (X_i - \bar{X})\right]^2 \operatorname{sign}(u^\top (X_i - \bar{X}))}{\sum_i \left[u^\top (X_i - \bar{X})\right]^2} \ . \tag{38}$$

Proposition 11. *Consider testing (8) versus (9) with the assumption $\nu \neq 1/2$ fixed, and $n \gg s\log(ep/s)$. Let T denote the statistic (38). There is a sequence of critical values t such that the test $\phi = \{T \geq t\}$ is asymptotically powerful, meaning $\gamma(\phi; \Omega_0, \Omega_1(\nu, R_1, r_n)) \to 0$, if*

$$\liminf \big(\nu(1-\nu)|1-2\nu|\big)^{2/3} r_n \left[\frac{s}{n}\log\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right)\right]^{-1/3} \geq C \ , \tag{39}$$

where C is a universal constant.

We see that this test achieves the minimax rate established in (35). Note that the minimax detection rate is substantially faster in the asymmetric case compare with the symmetric case.

Variable selection. Here too, we are unable to use the statistic (38) to perform variable selection. In analogy with the symmetric case, we consider the estimator $\hat{J} = \mathrm{supp}(\hat{u})$, where

$$\hat{u} \in \operatorname*{arg\,max}_{\|u\|=1, \|u\|_0 \leq s} \Big[\sum_i \big[u^\top (X_i - \bar{X})\big]^2 \mathrm{sign}(u^\top (X_i - \bar{X}))\Big] \Big[\sum_i \big[u^\top (X_i - \bar{X})\big]^2\Big]^{1/2} \ . \tag{40}$$

Despite the strong parallel with the statistic (31), we were not able to obtain a satisfactory performance for (40). We mention, as we did before, that other estimators may be needed when the signal is strong. And we also refer the reader to Section 4.1.2, where a coordinate-wise support estimator is introduced.

3.3 Diagonal model

A popular approach in situations where the covariance is unknown is to assume it is diagonal. In (supervised) classification this leads to diagonal linear discriminant analysis, which corresponds to the naive Bayes classifier in the Gaussian mixture model (Bickel and Levina, 2004). Define

$$\kappa = \|\Delta\mu_\ddagger\|_\infty / \|\Delta\mu_\ddagger\|, \quad \Delta\mu_\ddagger := \mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1/2}\Delta\mu \ . \tag{41}$$

Given $\nu \in (0,1)$, $a \in (0,1)$, and $s \leq p$, we consider the mixture testing problem with unknown diagonal covariance matrix

$$\breve{\Omega}_0 = \big\{\theta = (\nu, \mu, \mu, \mathbf{\Sigma}),\ \mu \in \mathbb{R}^p,\ \mathbf{\Sigma} \text{ diagonal psd}\big\}, \tag{42}$$

and, for $r_n > 0$,

$$\breve{\Omega}_1(\nu, R, r_n) := \breve{\Omega}_1(\nu) \cap \{\theta :\ R(\theta) \geq r_n\} \tag{43}$$

where

$$\breve{\Omega}_1(\nu) := \big\{\theta = (\nu, \mu_0, \mu_1, \mathbf{\Sigma}) : \mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathbb{R}^p \text{ satisfying (3)}, \mathbf{\Sigma} \text{ diagonal psd s.t. } \kappa \leq a\big\} \ .$$

In this situation, it is natural to estimate the covariance matrix by the diagonal of the sample covariance matrix. We can then use this estimator in place of $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ in (15), yielding the following statistic

$$\max_{\|u\|_0 \leq s} \frac{u^\top \hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}} u}{u^\top \mathrm{diag}(\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}) u}, \tag{44}$$

with the convention that $0/0 = 0$, where for a square matrix $A = (a_{ij})$ we define the diagonal matrix $\mathrm{diag}(A) = (a_{ij}\mathbb{1}_{\{i=j\}})$. The null distribution of the test statistic (44) does not depend on $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ as long as it is diagonal.

Proposition 12. *Consider testing* (42) *versus* (43) *with* $\nu \in (0,1)$ *fixed, and* $1 \ll \log p \ll n$. *Assume that* κ *in* (41) *is bounded away from 1.*

- Detection. *Let* T *denote the statistic* (44). *There is a sequence of critical values* t *such that the test* $\phi = \{T \geq t\}$ *is asymptotically powerful, meaning* $\gamma(\phi; \breve{\Omega}_0, \breve{\Omega}_1(\nu, R, r_n)) \to 0$, *if*

$$\nu(1-\nu)\, r_n \geq \frac{C}{1-a^2}\left[\sqrt{\frac{s}{n}\log(ep/s)} \vee \frac{s}{n}\log(ep/s)\right] , \tag{45}$$

  where $C > 0$ *is a universal constant.*

- Variable selection. *Let* $\hat{u}$ *denote a maximizer of* (44). *Then under the stronger condition* (18), *and assuming that* $\|\Delta\mu\|_0 > 1$ *and that the effective dynamic range of* $\Delta\mu_\ddagger$ *is bounded, the support of* $\hat{u}$ *is consistent for the support of* $\Delta\mu$.

Proposition 12 unveils an interesting phenomenon. When the covariance matrix is supposed to be diagonal but is unknown, there is a qualitative difference between the case $\|\Delta\mu\|_0 = 1$ and $\|\Delta\mu\|_0 > 1$. The conditions of Proposition 12 imply that $\|\Delta\mu\|_0 > 1$. When $\|\Delta\mu\|_0 = 1$, the statistic (44) is useless at either detection or variable selection, since in that situation $\mathrm{Cov}(X)$ is also diagonal under the alternative. In that case, the optimal detection rate is the same as that for general unknown covariances, that is $(\log(p)/n)^{1/4}$ when $\nu = 1/2$ and $(\log(p)/n)^{1/3}$ when $\nu \neq 1/2$. Indeed, the proofs of Propositions 4 and 9 only involve diagonal covariance matrices when $s = 1$. When $\|\Delta\mu\|_0 > 1$, (45) is the same as (17), meaning we can do as well as if $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ were known, as long as κ remains bounded away from 1, meaning that $\Delta\mu_\ddagger$ is not approximately 1-sparse.

4 Computationally tractable methods and numerical experiments

Modern datasets are routinely high-dimensional, resulting in an asymptotic analysis where the dimension grows with the sample size, i.e., $p \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$. Often now, p is of same order, or larger, than n. In this situation, a test statistic of the form $\max\{G(u; X_1, \ldots, X_n) : \|u\|_0 \leq s\}$, where G is a real-valued function, results in a combinatorial maximization over the subsets of $[p]$ of size at most s, and this is very quickly intractable when $s \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$, because there are $\binom{p}{s} \geq (p/s)^s$ such subsets.

To be more precise, here we say that a method is computationally tractable if it can be computed in time polynomial in (n, p, s). Although such a method may still be practically intractable for large problems, on a theoretical level, it provides a qualitative definition in line with a central concern in theoretical computer science. Among the statistics considered in Sections 2 and 3, only the largest eigenvalue $\hat{\lambda}_\Sigma^{\max}$ defined in (14) is known to be computable in polynomial time. All the other methods are tailored to the sparse setting and are combinatorial in nature. This motivates the development of computationally tractable methods for this setting.

4.1 Coordinate-wise methods

The simplest computationally tractable methods are arguably those based on testing each coordinate at a time. Such a method is of the form

$$M(T(X^1), \ldots, T(X^p)) , \tag{46}$$

where $X^j = (X_{i,j} : i \in [n])$ is the jth variable, T is a test statistic for mixture testing in dimension one, and M implements a multiple testing procedure. In what follows, we opt for the simple Bonferroni correction, which corresponds to $M(t_1, \ldots, t_p) = \max_j t_j$. Coordinate-wise testing and/or

variable selection of this type is considered in (Azizyan et al., 2013; Chan and Hall, 2010) and also in (Amini and Wainwright, 2009; Berthet and Rigollet, 2013b; Johnstone and Lu, 2009) in the context of sparse PCA. Except for (Chan and Hall, 2010), where a nonparametric setting is considered, these papers assume that $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is a known similarity matrix.

4.1.1 Known covariance

Denote $\mathbf{\Sigma} = (\sigma_{jk})$ and $\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}} = (\hat{\sigma}_{jk})$. Inspired by the statistic (19), we arrive at the maximum canonical variance statistic

$$\max_{j\in[p]} \frac{\hat{\sigma}_{jj}}{\sigma_{jj}} \ , \tag{47}$$

and at the corresponding support estimator

$$\hat{J} = \Big\{ j \in [p] : \hat{\sigma}_{jj}/\sigma_{jj} > 1 + 5\big(\sqrt{\tfrac{\log(p)}{n}} \vee \tfrac{\log(p)}{n}\big) \Big\} \ , \tag{48}$$

for a given threshold $\omega \to \infty$. Note that (47) corresponds to working with the test statistic $T(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_i (x_i - \bar{x})^2$ in (46).

Proposition 13. *Consider testing (10) versus (11) with $\nu \in (0,1)$ fixed, and $p \to \infty$. Denoting T the statistic (47), we consider the test $\phi = \big\{T \geq 1 + 5\big(\sqrt{\frac{\log(p)}{n}} \vee \frac{\log(p)}{n}\big)\big\}$. The test ϕ has asymptotic level zero. Moreover, it has asymptotic power one if*

$$\nu(1-\nu) \max_{j\in[p]} \frac{\Delta\mu_j^2}{\sigma_{jj}} > C_1 \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log(p)}{n}} \vee \frac{\log(p)}{n} \right) \ , \tag{49}$$

where $C_1 > 0$ is a universal constant. Moreover, the estimator (48) is consistent for the support of $\Delta\mu$ if

$$\nu(1-\nu) \min_{j\in J} \frac{\Delta\mu_j^2}{\sigma_{jj}} > C_2 \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log(p)}{n}} \vee \frac{\log(p)}{n} \right) \ ,$$

where $C_2 > 0$ is a universal constant.

The proof is a straightforward adaptation of that of Proposition 3, and is omitted.

Remark. A stronger result can be obtained by using (15) instead of (19), leading to $\hat{\lambda}^{\max}_{1,\mathbf{\Sigma}}$ instead of (47), but the approach is somewhat less natural and the resulting performance bound slightly less intuitive.

Special case $\mathbf{\Sigma} = \mathbf{I}$. In Section 2 we proved that the test based on (15) is asymptotically powerful under (17), that is $\nu(1-\nu)\|\Delta\mu\|^2 \geq C\big[\sqrt{\frac{s}{n}\log(ep/s)} \vee \frac{s}{n}\log(ep/s)\big]$, the coordinate-wise test was shown here to be asymptotically powerful under (49), that is $\nu(1-\nu)\|\Delta\mu\|_\infty^2 \geq C\big[\sqrt{\frac{\log(p)}{n}} \vee \frac{\log(p)}{n}\big]$. ($C$ is a sufficiently large constant.) When the energy of $\Delta\mu$ is spread over its support, we have $\|\Delta\mu\|_\infty \approx \|\Delta\mu\|/\sqrt{s}$, in which case the latter condition becomes $\nu(1-\nu)\|\Delta\mu\|^2 \geq C\big[\sqrt{\frac{s^2}{n}\log(ep/s)} \vee (\frac{s}{n}\log(ep/s))\big]$. Hence, the coordinate-wise method is shown to achieve a detection rate within a multiplicative factor $\sqrt{s}$ of the optimal rate. In the special situation where $n = O(\log p)$, the coordinate-wise method even achieves the optimal rate. In general, however, there is this multiplicative factor of $\sqrt{s}$ between the detection bounds. We speculate that this factor of $\sqrt{s}$ is unavoidable and incurred by any polynomial time method. Our speculation is based on an analogy with the sparse PCA detection problem and the recent work of Berthet and Rigollet

(2013a). These authors prove that a multiplicative factor of $\sqrt{s}$ applies to any polynomial time algorithm, if some classical problem in computational complexity, known as the Planted Clique Problem, is not solvable in polynomial time — see (Berthet and Rigollet, 2013a) for definitions and pointers to the literature. The above discussion is in fact valid for general covariance matrices $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ as long as the s-sparse Riesz constants are bounded.

4.1.2 Unknown covariance

We adapt the statistics (27) and (38) to coordinate-wise methods by considering $s = 1$, thus working with

$$T_1 = \max_{j\in[p]} T_{1,j} \ , \qquad T_{1,j} := \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{|X_{i,j} - \bar{X}_j|}{\sqrt{\hat{\sigma}_{jj}}} \ , \tag{50}$$

and

$$T_2 = \max_{j\in[p]} T_{2,j} \ , \qquad T_{2,j} := \Big| \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{(X_{i,j} - \bar{X}_j)^2}{\hat{\sigma}_{jj}} \operatorname{sign}(X_{i,j} - \bar{X}_j) \Big| \ . \tag{51}$$

Although the null distribution of (50) depends on the unknown covariance matrix $\mathbf{\Sigma}$, it can be calibrated by a simple Bonferroni correction, which is possible because the terms in the maximum have a null distribution that is independent of $\mathbf{\Sigma}$. The same applies to (51).

For any $u \in (0,1)$, denote by $q_1^{-1}(u)$ the $(1-u)$-quantile of the distribution of $T_{1,1}$ under the null hypothesis. Given some level $\alpha \in (0,1)$, denote by $\hat{J}_1$ the set of indices such that $T_{1,j}$ is significant at level α/p, namely,

$$\hat{J}_1 := \{j : T_{1,j} > q_1^{-1}(\alpha/p)\} \ .$$

The estimator $\hat{J}_2$ is defined analogously based on (51). Note that both quantile functions q_1^{-1} and q_2^{-1} can be easily estimated by Monte Carlo experiments.

Proposition 14. *Consider testing (8) versus (9) with $n \gg \log(p) \gg 1$. Consider a sequence of levels α satisfying $\alpha = o(1)$ and $\alpha \geq p^{-a}$ for some fixed $a > 0$ in the definition of $\hat{J}_1$ and $\hat{J}_2$.*

- Detection.

  The test $\phi_1 := \{\hat{J}_1 \neq \emptyset\}$ has a level smaller than α. Moreover, it has asymptotic power going to one if if $|\nu - 1/2| < \frac{1}{6}$ and

$$\max_{j\in[p]} \frac{(\Delta\mu_j)^2}{\sigma_{jj}} \gg \left[\frac{\log(p)}{n}\right]^{1/4} . \tag{52}$$

  The test $\phi_2 := \{\hat{J}_2 \neq \emptyset\}$ has a level smaller than α. Moreover, it has asymptotic power going to one if

$$\liminf \ \big(\nu(1-\nu)|1-2\nu|\big)^{2/3} \ \max_{j\in[p]} \frac{(\Delta\mu_j)^2}{\sigma_{jj}} \left[\frac{\log(p)}{n}\right]^{-1/3} \geq C \ . \tag{53}$$

- Variable selection. *Assume that the effective dynamic range of $\Delta\mu$ and the $2s$-sparse Riesz constant of $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ are both bounded.*

  ■ *If $|\nu - 1/2| < \frac{1}{6}$, then under the stronger condition that*

$$\frac{\|\Delta\mu\|^4}{\Delta\mu^\top \mathbf{\Sigma} \Delta\mu} \gg s \left[\frac{\log(p)}{n}\right]^{1/4} \ , \tag{54}$$

  $\hat{J}_1$ is consistent for the support of $\Delta\mu$.

■ *If $\nu \neq 1/2$ is fixed, then under the stronger condition that*

$$\frac{\|\Delta\mu\|^4}{\Delta\mu^\top \mathbf{\Sigma} \Delta\mu} \gg s\left[\frac{\log(p)}{n}\right]^{1/3}, \tag{55}$$

$\hat{J}_2$ is consistent for the support of $\Delta\mu$.

Remark. Assuming the energy of $\Delta\mu$ is spread over its support, and that the s-sparse Riesz constant of $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is bounded, (52) and (53) reduce to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\|\Delta\mu\|^4}{\Delta\mu^\top \mathbf{\Sigma} \Delta\mu} &\gg s\left[\frac{\log(p)}{n}\right]^{1/4} = s^{3/4}\left[s\frac{\log(p)}{n}\right]^{1/4}, \\ \big(\nu(1-\nu)|1-2\nu|\big)^{2/3}\frac{\|\Delta\mu\|^4}{\Delta\mu^\top \mathbf{\Sigma} \Delta\mu} &\geq Cs\left[\frac{\log(p)}{n}\right]^{1/3} = Cs^{2/3}\left[s\frac{\log(p)}{n}\right]^{1/3}. \end{aligned}$$

Compared to (28) and (39), the performances of the coordinate-wise methods are within $s^{3/4}$ and $s^{2/3}$ multiplicative factors, respectively, of the optimal rates. We do not know to what extent this is intrinsic to the problem, namely, whether there are polynomial time methods with performance bounds that come closer to the optimal bounds.

4.2 Other computationally tractable methods

Beyond methods based on examining k-tuples of coordinates, instead of just $k = 1$ coordinate at a time, and other heuristics based on principal component analysis (Srivastava, 1984), more sophisticated methods may be needed. We present two methods based on relaxations of the sparse eigenvalue problem, which we learned from Berthet and Rigollet (2013b), who applied it to the problem of detecting a top principal component in a spiked covariance model. See also (Amini and Wainwright, 2009). Assume for simplicity that $\mathbf{\Sigma} = \mathbf{I}$ (or, equivalently, that it is diagonal and known), so that the sparse eigenvalues defined in (15) and (19) coincide, and in both cases, the maximization is over s-sparse unit vectors.

- The first relaxation is the semidefinite program (SDP) of d'Aspremont et al. (2007):

$$\mathrm{SDP}_s(\mathbf{A}) = \max_{\mathbf{Z}} \mathrm{trace}(\mathbf{AZ}), \quad \text{subject to } \mathbf{Z} \succeq 0,\ \mathrm{trace}(\mathbf{Z}) = 1,\ |\mathbf{Z}|_1 \leq s, \tag{56}$$

  where the maximum is over positive semidefinite matrices $\mathbf{Z} = (Z_{st})$ and $|\mathbf{Z}|_1 = \sum_{s,t}|Z_{st}|$. We would then use $\mathrm{SDP}_s(\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}})$.

- The second relaxation leads to using the minimum dual perturbation

$$\mathrm{MDP}_s(\mathbf{A}) := \min_{z \geq 0}\left[\lambda^{\max}(\tau_z(\mathbf{A})) + sz\right], \tag{57}$$

  where τ_z is entry-wise soft-thresholding at z, meaning that for a matrix $\mathbf{A} = (a_{jk})$, $\tau_z(\mathbf{A}) = (b_{jk})$, where $b_{jk} = \mathrm{sign}(a_{jk})\max(|a_{jk}| - z, 0)$. We would then use $\mathrm{MDP}_s(\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}})$.

Both relaxations operate in polynomial time. That said, the semidefinite program does not scale well, while the second relaxation is computationally more friendly as it boils down to a one-dimensional grid search over $z \in \mathbb{R}$ requiring the computation of the top eigenvalue of symmetric matrix at every grid point.

Proposition 15. *Consider testing (10) versus (11) with $\nu \in (0,1)$ fixed, and $n \wedge p \to \infty$. Let T denote either of the statistics $\mathrm{SDP}_s(\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}})$ or $\mathrm{MDP}_s(\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}})$. For some universal constant $C_0 > 0$, consider the test $\phi = \{T \geq 1 + C_0\big[\sqrt{\frac{s^2}{n}\log(ep/s)} \vee \frac{s}{n}\log(ep/s)\big]\}$. The test ϕ has asymptotic level zero. Moreover, it has asymptotic power going to one if*

$$\nu(1-\nu)\Delta\mu^\top \mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1}\Delta\mu \geq C_1\Big[\sqrt{\frac{s^2}{n}\log\Big(\frac{ep}{s}\Big)} \vee \frac{s}{n}\log\Big(\frac{ep}{s}\Big)\Big] \ ,$$

where $C_1 > 0$ is a universal constant.

The proof of Proposition 15 is a straightforward adaptation of the work of Berthet and Rigollet (2013b). The critical ingredient is the following inequality

$$\lambda_s^{\max}(\mathbf{A}) \leq \mathrm{SDP}_s(\mathbf{A}) \leq \mathrm{MDP}_s(\mathbf{A}) \ , \tag{58}$$

valid for any psd matrix $\mathbf{A}$ and any sparsity level s. Then, on the one hand, we find in (Berthet and Rigollet, 2013b, Prop. 6.2) that $\mathrm{MDP}_s(\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}) \leq 1 + C_1\big[\sqrt{\frac{s^2}{n}\log(ep/s)} \vee \frac{s}{n}\log(ep/s)\big]$ with probability tending to one under the null (where the sample is iid standard normal); while, on the other hand, following what we did in the proof of Proposition 3, we find that $\lambda_s^{\max}(\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{n} + C_2\nu(1-\nu)\Delta\mu^\top\mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1}\Delta\mu$ with probability tending to one under the alternative. From these two bounds and (58), we conclude.

Remark. We notice the same $\sqrt{s}$ multiplicative factor and one wonders whether the added sophistication of these relaxations (SDP or MDP) is worth it. Clearly not from a theoretical standpoint, but it shows in our numerical experiments presented in Section 4.3. This is analogous to what Berthet and Rigollet (2013b) observed in the context of detecting a first principal component.

Remark. We do not know of any analogous relaxations for the statistics presented in Section 3 for the case where the covariance matrix is unknown.

4.3 Numerical experiments

We present here the result of some small-scale computer simulations meant to compare some of the computationally tractable tests introduced above. In all the experiments, we chose $p = 500$, $n = 200$, and the underlying covariance matrix $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ (whether assumed known or unknown) was taken to be the identity. The variables were generated with zero mean under both the null and the alternative. The difference in means, $\Delta\mu$, was chosen to be equally spread (in terms of energy) over all its nonzero coordinates. Specifically, we chose $\Delta\mu_j = A\mathbb{1}_{\{j\leq s\}}/\sqrt{s}$, where the sparsity s ranged over $\{1, 5, 10, 30\}$, while the amplitude $A = \|\Delta\mu\|$ varied the difficulty of the detection problem. We focused entirely on the symmetric model where $\nu = 1/2$. Each setting was repeated 100 times.

4.3.1 Known covariance

In this set of experiments, we assume that $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is known to be the identity, and compared the maximum canonical variance (47), the s-largest canonical variance $\hat{\sigma}_{jj}/\sigma_{jj}$, the top sample eigenvalue (14), and the MDP statistics defined in (57). Note that the s-largest canonical variance and the MDP_s both require knowledge of s. The results from these experiments are shown as power curves in Figure 1. Among other things, they confirm that the maximum canonical eigenvalue performs best when $\Delta\mu$ is really sparse whereas top sample eigenvalues performs best for less sparse signals – see Table 3. At least in the particular setting of these simulations, the combination of the maximum

canonical variance and the top sample eigenvalue is competitive. An alternative — which we did not implement and is most relevant when $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is diagonal — would be a higher-criticism approach applied to the canonical variances $\hat{\sigma}_{jj}/\sigma_{jj}$, which under the null are iid $\frac{1}{n}\chi^2_{n-1}$.



$s = 1$ $s = 5$ $s = 10$ $s = 30$

Figure 1: Power curves for the largest canonical variance (red), s-th largest canonical variance (green), top sample eigenvalue (blue) and MDP (magenta) for various sparsity levels s as displayed. The level was set at 0.05 by simulation. On the horizontal axis is $A = \|\Delta\mu\|$, while on the vertical axis is the proportion of rejections (out of 100 repeats).

4.3.2 Unknown covariance (kurtosis versus first moment)

In this set of experiments, we assume that $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is unknown (even though it remains the identity), and compared the coordinate-wise kurtosis and first absolute moment. We used the maximum canonical variance (whose calibration is only possible when $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is known) as an oracle benchmark. Although we have a tighter control of the first moment under the null compared to the kurtosis, in these experiments the two behave very similarly.



$s = 1$ $s = 5$ $s = 10$ $s = 30$

Figure 2: Power curves for the largest canonical variance (red), the largest canonical kurtosis (green), and the largest canonical absolute moment (blue), for various sparsity levels s as displayed. The level was set at 0.05 by simulation. On the horizontal axis is $A = \|\Delta\mu\|$, while on the vertical axis is the proportion of rejections (out of 100 repeats).

5 Discussion

This paper leaves a number of interesting open problems regarding the theory of clustering under sparsity. We list a few of them below.

- *The generalized likelihood ratio test (GLRT).* The GLRT performs well in very many testing problems. In this paper we simply focused on obtaining tests that achieved the various optimal detection rates, and we are curious to know whether the GLRT is one of them, at least in some of the settings. If anything, the GLRT is computationally very intensive in high dimensions, even more so than the moment-based methods analyzed here, and therefore not practical, while heuristic implementations à la EM are very hard to analyze.

- *Theoretical adaptation to unknown sparsity.* Throughout the paper, except in Section 4.1, we work under the assumption that the size of the support of $\Delta\mu$ — the shift in means defined in (3) — is known. This is in fact a mild assumption. Indeed, on the one hand, the problem is harder when s is unknown (since the set of alternatives is larger), so that the minimax lower bounds developed in the paper apply to the case where s is unknown. On the other hand, one can easily check that there is enough lee-way in the concentration bounds developed (under the null) for the various procedures that rely on the sparsity of $\Delta\mu$ to accommodate a scan over a range of support sizes.

- *Adaptation to unknown sparsity for computationally tractable procedures.* We also note that the coordinate-wise methods studied in Section 4.1 do not require the knowledge of the sparsity. When the population covariance matrix $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is known, one can rely on the maximal canonical variance statistic (47) and the top eigenvalue statistic (47) together with a Bonferroni correction to simultaneously achieve the rates of Table 3 for all s.

- *Unknown mixing probability for unknown variance* In practice, ν is usually unknown, and in fact we may not even know whether $\nu = 1/2$ or $\nu \neq 1/2$. Nevertheless, relying on the coordinate-wise statistics (50) and (51) together with a Bonferroni correction is an easy way to adapt to situations where ν is unknown and may be arbitrary. Concerning the variable selection problem, one can consider the union $\hat{J}_1 \cup \hat{J}_2$ of the variables detected by the coordinate-wise first moment and second signed moment methods.

- *Mixture models with different covariances.* We assumed everywhere in the paper that the two populations had the same covariance matrix. When this is not the case, assuming the two population covariance matrices are known (both under the null and under the alternative) does not seem as meaningful, and the case where they are unknown is more complex, and we speculate that more sophisticated methods that attempt to cluster the data into two groups (as the GLRT does) may be required. We note, however, that the procedure presented in Section 3.3 applies in exactly the same way to the special case where the population covariance matrices are diagonal — although the performance bound established in Proposition 12 is not valid.

- *Mixture models with more than two components.* Suppose the mixture, under the alternative, has $K \geq 2$ components, with the kth component having mean μ_k and proportion ν_k, and consider for simplicity the case where the population covariance matrix is known to be the identity, both under the null and the alternative. Then, under the alternative,

$$\mathrm{Cov}(X) = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \nu_k(1-\nu_k)\mu_k\mu_k^\top + \sum_{1\leq k<\ell\leq K} \nu_k\nu_\ell(\mu_k\mu_\ell^\top + \mu_\ell\mu_k^\top) + \mathbf{I}\,.$$

In the general situation where the group means are affine independent, $\mathrm{Cov}(X)$ is a rank $K-1$ perturbation of the identity matrix. It is therefore natural to consider a test based on the top $K-1$ s-sparse eigenvalues of the sample covariance matrix. We note, though, that when K is fixed, the top s-sparse eigenvalue is still able to achieve the optimal detection rate. See Hsu and Kakade (2013) for related results in a non-sparse setting. We did not investigate the case where the population covariance matrix is unknown. Recently, Jin and Wang (2014) have also studied the case where the population covariance matrices are diagonal but unknown.

- *Computational issues.* Computational considerations have lead a number of researchers coordinate-wise methods as we did in Section 4.1. In Section 4.2 we studied an SDP relaxation in the context of mixture detection when the covariance matrix is known to be the identity. It seems possible to extend this to the case of a general known covariance matrix. If anything, the suboptimal test based on (19) can be relaxed in the same exact way since it is based on computing a top sparse eigenvalue. And the same is true of the diagonal model. However, we do not know how to relax any of the tests considered for the case where the covariance matrix is unknown.

6 Proofs: lower bounds

We start with proving the lower bounds. The arguments follow standard lines, but the calculations are delicate at times. The basic idea is to reduce the hypothesis testing problem to a simple versus simple hypothesis testing problem, by putting priors on the null and alternative sets of distributions.

In the sequel, we use the notation

$$\zeta = \frac{s}{n} \log(ep/s) \ . \tag{59}$$

We first reduce to the case where the variables have zero mean. And when the null is composite, we focus on the isotropic sub-case. We then put a prior on $\Delta\mu$ to reduce the alternative to a simple hypothesis. Except in Section 6.4, we let ϱ denote the uniform distribution on the set of s-sparse vectors in $\mathbb{R}^p$ whose non-zero values either equal r or $-r$ — the dependency on r being left implicit — and choose it as prior. We then determine the value of r that makes the testing problem difficult.

This reduction to a simple versus simple hypothesis testing provides a lower bound on the worst-case risk for the original testing problem. The last step consists in lower bounding the risk of the likelihood ratio (LR) test for the simple versus simple problem, which lower bounds the risk of any other test since the LR test is optimal by the Neyman-Pearson lemma. If L is the LR for a simple versus a simple, then its risk is equal to

$$1 - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_0 \left| L - 1 \right| \geq 1 - \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_0(L^2) - 1} \ , \tag{60}$$

where $\mathbb{E}_0$ denote the expectation under the null and the inequality is Cauchy-Schwarz's. Hence, the goal of the (long, and sometimes tedious) calculations that follow is to upper-bound the second moment of the LR.

We will reduce the hypergeometric to the binomial distribution using the following taken from (Aldous, 1985, p.173). Here, $\mathrm{Hyper}(m, n, N)$ refers to the hypergeometric distribution which arises when picking m balls at random from an urn with n red balls and $N - n$ blue balls, and counting the number of red balls.

Lemma 1. *For any integers $1 \leq m, n \leq N$, there is a σ-algebra $\mathcal{B}$ and a binomial random variable W with parameters $(m, n/N)$ such that $\mathbb{E}(W|\mathcal{B}) \sim \mathrm{Hyper}(m, n, N)$.*

We will also use Chernoff's bound for the binomial distribution.

Lemma 2 (Chernoff's bound)**.** *For any positive integer n and any $0 < p < q < 1$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(Bin(n,p) \geq qn\right) \leq \exp\left(-nH_p(q)\right) \ , \tag{61}$$

where the entropy function $H_p(q)$ satisfies

$$H_p(q) \geq q \log\left(\frac{q}{p}\right) - q + p \ .$$

6.1 Proof of Proposition 1

We prove simultaneously both results ($s = p$ and $s = o(p)$). We may assume without loss of generality that $\mathbf{\Sigma} = \mathbf{I}$. Following the steps outline at the beginning of Section 6, we reduce the testing problem to

$$\tilde{H}_0 : X \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}) \quad \text{versus} \quad \tilde{H}_1 : X \sim \nu\mathcal{N}(-(1-\nu)\mu, \mathbf{I}) + (1-\nu)\mathcal{N}(\nu\mu, \mathbf{I}) \ , \ \mu \sim \varrho \ .$$

(For brevity, we use μ in place of $\Delta\mu := \mu$.) Observe that $\|\mu\|^2 = sr^2$ with probability one under ϱ. Based on the statement of Proposition 1, we assume that

$$sr^2 = o\left(\sqrt{p/n}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \limsup\left[sr^4 \wedge r^2\right] n/\log(ep/s) < 1 \ . \tag{62}$$

Denote by $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_0$ (resp. $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_1$) the distribution of the sample under H_0 (resp. $\tilde{H}_1$), $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_0$ the expectation with respect to $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_0$. The likelihood ratio is therefore $L := d\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_1/d\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_0$. By (60) above, it suffices to show that $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_0(L^2) \leq 1 + o(1)$, to prove that all test statistics are asymptotically powerless.

For an integer $p \geq 1$, let $\mathbb{H}^p = \{-1, 1\}^p$, and with some abuse of notation, for a set $S \subset [p]$, let $\mathbb{H}^S$ denote the set of vectors in $\mathbb{R}$ with support S and nonzero entries equal to ± 1. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
L &= \frac{1}{\binom{p}{s}2^s} \sum_S \sum_{\gamma \in \mathbb{H}^S} \frac{\prod_{i=1}^n \left(\nu e^{-\frac{\|X_i - r(1-\nu)\gamma\|^2}{2}} + (1-\nu)e^{-\frac{\|X_i + r\nu\gamma\|^2}{2}}\right)}{\prod_{i=1}^n e^{-\frac{\|X_i\|^2}{2}}} \\
&= \frac{1}{2^s}\frac{1}{\binom{p}{s}} \sum_S \sum_{\gamma \in \mathbb{H}^S} \prod_{i=1}^n \left(\nu e^{\sum_{j\in S} r(1-\nu)\gamma_j X_{i,j}} e^{-sr^2(1-\nu)^2/2} + (1-\nu)e^{-\sum_{j\in S} r\nu\gamma_j X_{i,j}}\right) e^{-sr^2\nu^2/2} \\
&= \frac{1}{2^s}\frac{1}{\binom{p}{s}} \sum_S \sum_{\gamma \in \mathbb{H}^S} \mathbb{E}_\eta\left[\exp\left\{r\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j\in S} \gamma_j \eta_i X_{i,j} - \frac{sr^2}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_j^2\right\}\right] \ .
\end{aligned}$$

where $\eta := (\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_n)$ denote n random variables such that that $\mathbb{P}(\eta = \nu) = 1 - \nu$ and $\mathbb{P}(\eta = -(1-\nu)) = \nu$, $\mathbb{E}_\eta(.)$ is the expectation with respect to η, $X_{i,j}$ denotes the jth entry of the vector $X_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$, and the sum is over $S \subset [p]$ with $|S| = s$. Turning to the second moment of L, we denote $\bar{\eta}$ an independent observation η. We derive

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_0[L^2] &= \frac{1}{\left(\binom{p}{s}2^s\right)^2} \sum_{S,\bar{S}} \sum_{\gamma \in \mathbb{H}^S, \bar{\gamma} \in \mathbb{H}^{\bar{S}}} \mathbb{E}_{\eta,\bar{\eta}} \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_0\left[\exp\left\{r\sum_{j\in S}\sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_j\eta_i X_{i,j} + r\sum_{j\in \bar{S}}\sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\gamma}_j\bar{\eta}_i X_{i,j} - \frac{sr^2}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n(\eta_i^2 + \bar{\eta}_i^2)\right\}\right] \\
&= \frac{1}{\binom{p}{s}^2} \sum_{S,\bar{S}} 2^{2|S\triangle\bar{S}| - 2s} \sum_{\gamma,\bar{\gamma} \in \mathbb{H}^{S\cap\bar{S}}} \mathbb{E}_{\eta,\bar{\eta}} \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_0\left[\exp\left\{r\sum_{j\in S\cap\bar{S}}\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\gamma_j\eta_i + \bar{\gamma}_j\bar{\eta}_i\right) X_{i,j} - \frac{|S\cap\bar{S}|r^2}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n(\eta_i^2 + \bar{\eta}_i^2)\right\}\right] \\
&= \frac{1}{\binom{p}{s}^2} \sum_{S,\bar{S}} \frac{1}{2^{2|S\cap\bar{S}|}} \sum_{\gamma,\bar{\gamma} \in \mathbb{H}^{S\cap\bar{S}}} \mathbb{E}_{\eta,\bar{\eta}} \exp\left\{r^2 \sum_{j\in S\cap\bar{S}}\sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_j\bar{\gamma}_j\eta_i\bar{\eta}_i\right\} \ .
\end{aligned}$$

Define the centered random variable $U_i = \eta_i \bar{\eta}_i$ which takes values ν^2 with probability $(1-\nu)^2$, $(1-\nu)^2$ with probability ν^2 and $-\nu(1-\nu)$ with probability $2(1-\nu)\nu$. Relying on the fact that S and $\bar{S}$ are distributed uniformly over the subsets of $[p]$ of size s, we denote $\mathbb{E}_{S,\bar{S}}$ the integration with respect to the distribution of S and $\bar{S}$. Given $S \cap \bar{S}$, observe $(V_j := \gamma_j \bar{\gamma}_j)$, $j \in S \cap \bar{S}$ follow independent Rademacher distribution. Denoting $U := \sum_{i=1}^n U_i$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_0[L^2] &= \mathbb{E}_{S,\bar{S}}\, \mathbb{E}_{\gamma,\bar{\gamma}}\, \mathbb{E}_{\eta,\bar{\eta}} \Big[\exp\big\{ r^2 U \sum_{j \in S \cap \bar{S}} V_j \big\} \Big] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{S,\bar{S}}\, \mathbb{E}_{\eta,\bar{\eta}} \Big[\cosh\big(r^2 U\big)^{|S \cap \bar{S}|} \Big] \,.\end{aligned}$$

Since $|S \cap \bar{S}| \sim \mathrm{Hyper}(s,s,p)$, by Lemma 1 there exists a binomial random variable W with parameters $(s, s/p)$ and a σ-field $\mathcal{B}$ such that $|S \cap \bar{S}| \sim \mathbb{E}[W|\mathcal{B}]$. By Jensen inequality, we derive

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_0[L^2] &\le \mathbb{E}\left[\left\{ 1 + \frac{s}{p}\big(\cosh\big\{r^2 U\big\} - 1 \big) \right\}^s \right] \\ &= 1 + \sum_{k=1}^s \binom{s}{k} \left(\frac{s}{p}\right)^k \mathbb{E}\left[\big\{ \cosh\big(r^2 U\big) - 1 \big\}^k \right] \,.\end{aligned}$$

For any positive x smaller than 1, $\cosh(x) - 1 \le x^2$. It follows that

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_0[L^2] - 1 \le \sum_{k=1}^s \binom{s}{k} \left(\frac{s}{p}\right)^k \mathbb{E}\left[\big(r^4 U^2\big)^k + e^{k r^2 |U|} \mathbb{1}_{\{r^2|U| \ge 1\}} \right]$$

Using the fact that $\binom{s}{k} \le \big(\frac{es}{k}\big)^k$, it is enough to prove that the two following terms go to zero:

$$\text{(I)} := \sum_{k=1}^s \left(\frac{s^2 e}{pk}\right)^k \mathbb{E}\left[\big(r^4 U^2\big)^k \right] \,, \tag{63}$$

$$\text{(II)} := \sum_{k=1}^s \left(\frac{s^2 e}{pk}\right)^k \mathbb{E}\left[e^{k r^2 |U|} \mathbb{1}_{\{r^2|U| \ge 1\}} \right] \,. \tag{64}$$

Recall that U is the sum of n independent centered random variables. Each term of the corresponding developpment of U^{2k} into n^{2k} term has an expectation of smaller than 1. The expectation of one term non-zero only if no variable U_i occurs exactly one time. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[U^{2k}\right] &\le \sum_{q=1}^{n \wedge k} \binom{n}{q} q^{2k} \le \sum_{q=1}^{n \wedge k} \big(\frac{ne}{q}\big)^q q^{2k} \\ &\le k(nek)^k \,,\end{aligned}$$

where we used in the last line that $q^k \le k^k$ and $q^{k-q} \le n^{k-q}$. Incorporating this bound into (I), we get

$$\text{(I)} \le \sum_{k=1}^s k \left(\frac{6 s^2 r^4 n}{p}\right)^k = o(1) \,,$$

since $s^2 r^4 n / p = o(1)$, because of the left-hand side of (62).

Let us turn to the second term (64). First, by a simple integration, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[e^{kr^2|U|}\mathbb{1}_{\{r^2|U|\geq 1\}}\right] &\leq 2\,\mathbb{E}\left[e^{kr^2U}\right] = 2\Big[(1-\nu)^2e^{kr^2\nu^2}+\nu^2e^{kr^2(1-\nu)^2}+2\nu(1-\nu)e^{-kr^2\nu(1-\nu)}\Big]^n \\ &\leq 2\exp\left[n\left(kr^2\wedge\frac{k^2r^4}{2}\right)\right]\,,\end{aligned}$$

since for $kr^2\leq 2$, we have

$$(1-\nu)^2e^{kr^2\nu^2}+\nu^2e^{kr^2(1-\nu)^2}+2\nu(1-\nu)e^{-kr^2\nu(1-\nu)}\leq e^{k^2r^4/2}\,,$$

by comparing the power expansions. We derive a second upper bound of $\mathbb{E}\left[e^{kr^2|U|}\mathbb{1}_{\{r^2|U|\geq 1\}}\right]$ when $4kr^4n\leq 1$. By Integration by parts ad Hoeffding's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\,\mathbb{E}\left[e^{kr^2|U|}\mathbb{1}_{\{r^2|U|\geq 1\}}\right] &= e^k\,\mathbb{P}[U\geq r^{-2}+\int_{r^{-2}}^{\infty}kr^2e^{kr^2x}\,\mathbb{P}[U\geq x]dx \\ &\leq \exp\left[k-\tfrac{1}{2nr^4}\right]+\int_{r^{-2}}^{\infty}kr^2\exp\left[x\left(kr^2-\frac{x}{2n}\right)\right]dx \\ &\leq e^{-1/(4nr^4)}+\int_{r^{-2}}^{\infty}kr^2e^{-x/(4nr^2)}]dx \\ &\leq 2e^{-1/(4nr^4)}\,.\end{aligned}$$

Define $k_*=\lfloor 1/(4nr^4)\rfloor$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\text{(II)} &\leq 4\sum_{k=1}^{k_*}\left(\frac{s^2e}{pk}\right)^k e^{-1/(4nr^4)}+2\sum_{k=k_*+1}^{s}\left(\frac{s^2e}{pk}\right)^k\exp\left[n\left(kr^2\wedge\frac{k^2r^4}{2}\right)\right] \\ &= \text{(III)}+\text{(IV)}\,.\end{aligned}$$

First, we bound (III). Define the sequence u_n by $u_n:=ns^2r^4/p$ and observe that u_n goes to zero because of the left-hand side of (62).

Consider two cases $s^2/p\geq\sqrt{u_n}$ and $s^2/p>\sqrt{u_n}$. When $s^2/p>\sqrt{u_n}$ we use the the fact that $e^x\geq(xe/k)^k$ for any $x\geq 0$ and any $k\geq 1$ (derive with respect to k) to obtain $\left(\frac{s^2e}{pk}\right)^k\leq e^{s^2/p}$. When $s^2/p<\sqrt{u_n}$, we use $u_n=o(1)$ to get $\left(\frac{s^2e}{pk}\right)^k\leq\frac{es^2}{p}$ for any positive integer k. We then derive

$$\begin{aligned}\text{(III)} &\leq 4k_*e^{-1/(4r^4n)}\left[e^{s^2/p}\mathbb{1}_{\{s^2\geq\sqrt{u_n}p\}}+\frac{es^2}{p}\mathbb{1}_{\{s^2<\sqrt{u_n}p\}}\right] \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{r^4n}e^{-(1-o(1))/(4r^4n)}\mathbb{1}_{\{s^2\geq\sqrt{u_n}p\}}+\frac{s^2}{pr^4n}e^{-1/(4r^4n)}\mathbb{1}_{\{s^2<\sqrt{u_n}p\}}\,,\end{aligned}\tag{65}$$

because of the left-hand side of (62). If $s^2>\sqrt{u_n}p$, $(r^4n)^{-1}=s^2/(pu_n)\geq(u_n)^{-1/2}\to\infty$ and it follows that (III) $=o(1)$. If $s^2<\sqrt{u_n}p$, note that $s^2/p=o(1)$ and that the function $x\mapsto xe^{-x}$ is bounded so that (III) also goes to zero.

To conclude, we control the expression (IV). We have

$$\text{(IV)} \leq 2\sum_{k=k_*+1}^{s}\exp\left[k\left\{\log\left(\frac{s^2e}{pk}\right)+n\left(r^2\wedge\frac{kr^4}{2}\right)\right\}\right]=:2\sum_{k=k_*+1}^{s}\exp\left[k\psi(k)\right]\,.$$

By derivation, we obtain $\sup_{k=k_*+1}^{s} \psi(k) \leq \psi[(4r^4n)^{-1}] \vee \psi[(s \wedge \frac{1}{r^2}) \vee (4r^4n)^{-1}]$. Since $k_* \to \infty$ (left-hand side of (62)), all we have to prove is that this supremum is negative and bounded away from zero. First,

$$\psi\left[(4r^4n^2)^{-1}\right] \leq \log\left(\frac{4nr^4s^2e}{p}\right) + 1 \to -\infty \ ,$$

because of the left-hand side of (62). For $k = s$, we have

$$\psi(s) \leq \log\left(\frac{se}{p}\right) + n(sr^4 \wedge r^2) = \log\left(\frac{pe}{s}\right)\left[-1 + \frac{n(sr^4 \wedge r^2)}{\log(ep/s)}\right] \ ,$$

which is negative and bounded away from zero because of the right-hand side of (62). The last case ($k = 1/r^2$) only occurs when $r^{-2} \leq s$ and $r^{-2} \geq (4nr^4)^{-1}$. These two conditions imply that $s \leq 4n$. Since $s^2r^4n/p = o(1)$ (left-hand side of (62)),

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi(r^{-2}) &= \log\left(\frac{s^2r^2e}{p}\right) + n\left[r^2 \wedge \frac{sr^4}{2}\right] \\
&= -\log\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right) + \log\left(sr^2e^2\right) + n\left[r^2 \wedge \frac{sr^4}{2}\right] \\
&\leq -\log\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right) + \log\left(o(1)\sqrt{p/n}\right) + n\left[r^2 \wedge \frac{sr^4}{2}\right] \\
&\leq \log(o(1)) - \log\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right) + \frac{1}{2}\log\log(p/s) + n\left[r^2 \wedge \frac{sr^4}{2}\right] \ .
\end{aligned}$$

By the right-hand side of (62), we derive that $-\log(ep/s) + \frac{1}{2}\log\log(p/s) + n[r^2 \wedge sr^4/2]$ is negative for both $p/s \to \infty$ and $s = p$ and for n large enough. As a consequence, $\psi(r^{-2}) \to -\infty$ and we conclude that IV $= o(1)$.

6.2 Proof of Proposition 4

We prove simultaneously both results ($s = p$ and $s = o(p)$) by following the same approach as for the proof of Proposition 1. We use the analogous notation. Given a vector μ of norm strictly smaller than one, the matrix $\mathbf{\Sigma}_\mu := \mathbf{I} - \mu\mu^\top$ is positive definite. We reduce the problem to testing

$$\tilde{H}_0 : X \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}) \quad \text{versus} \quad \tilde{H}_1 : X \sim \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{N}(-\mu, \mathbf{\Sigma}_\mu) + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{N}(\mu, \mathbf{\Sigma}_\mu) \ , \ \mu \sim \varrho \ .$$

Observe that $\frac{\|\Delta\mu\|^4}{\Delta\mu^\top \mathbf{\Sigma}_\mu \Delta\mu} = \Delta\mu^\top \mathbf{\Sigma}_\mu^{-1} \Delta\mu = 4\frac{\kappa^2}{1-\kappa^2}$ with $\kappa^2 := sr^2 < 1$.

Defining the likelihood ratio $L := d\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_1/d\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_0$, we know that all tests are asymptotically powerless if $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_0[L^2] \to 1$. Thus, it suffices to prove that $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_0[L^2] \to 1$ for for $\kappa^2/(1-\kappa^2)$ sufficiently small.

By definition of μ, the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{\Sigma}_\mu^{-1}$ are all equal to 1 except of one of them equal to $1/(1-\kappa^2)$. Moreover, for any $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^p$,

$$a^\top \mathbf{\Sigma}_\mu^{-1} b = (a^\top b) + \frac{(a^\top \mu)(b^\top \mu)}{1-\kappa^2} \ .$$

Thus, the likelihood L writes as

$$\begin{aligned} L &= \frac{(1-\kappa^2)^{-n/2}}{\binom{p}{s}2^{s+n}} \sum_S \sum_{\gamma\in\mathbb{H}^S} \sum_\eta \frac{\prod_{i=1}^n \exp\left[-\sum_{j\notin S}\frac{X_{i,j}^2}{2} - \frac{(X_{i,S}-\eta_i r\gamma)^\top \mathbf{\Sigma}_{r\gamma}^{-1}(X_{i,S}-\eta_i r\gamma)}{2}\right]}{\prod_{i=1}^n e^{-\frac{\|X_i\|^2}{2}}} \\ &= (1-\kappa^2)^{-n/2}\frac{1}{\binom{p}{s}2^{s+n}} \sum_S \sum_{\gamma\in\mathbb{H}^S} \sum_\eta \exp\left[-\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(X_{i,S}-\eta_i r\gamma)^\top \mathbf{\Sigma}_{r\gamma}^{-1}(X_{i,S}-\eta_i r\gamma)}{2} + \frac{\|X_{i,S}\|^2}{2}\right] \\ &= \frac{e^{-\frac{n\kappa^2}{2(1-\kappa^2)}}}{(1-\kappa^2)^{n/2}}\frac{1}{\binom{p}{s}2^{s+n}} \sum_S \sum_{\gamma\in\mathbb{H}^S} \sum_\eta \prod_{i=1}^n \exp\left[-\frac{r^2\langle X_{i,S},\gamma\rangle^2}{2(1-\kappa^2)} + \frac{r}{1-\kappa^2}\eta_i\langle X_{i,S},\gamma\rangle\right] . \end{aligned} \tag{66}$$

Let us turn to the second moment.

Lemma 3. *Let T be distributed a sum of K independent Rademacher variables where K is a hypergeometric random variable with parameters (p,s,s). We have*

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_0[L^2] = \mathbb{E}\left[\left(1-r^4T^2\right)^{-n/2}\exp\left(\frac{-nr^4T^2}{1-r^4T^2}\right)\cosh^n\left(\frac{r^2T}{1-r^4T^2}\right)\right] . \tag{67}$$

This result is proved in Section 6.2.1. Given this expression, we consider two upper bounds of $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_0[L^2]$ depending on the value of ζ (defined in (59)).

CASE A: No assumption on ζ. This corresponds to the minimax lower bounds (21) and (23). We assume in the following that

$$\frac{\kappa^2}{1-\kappa^2} \ll (p/n)^{1/4} \qquad \text{if} \qquad s=p\ , \tag{68}$$

$$\limsup \frac{\kappa^2}{1-\kappa^2}\left(\frac{n}{s\log(p/s)}\right)^{1/4} < \frac{1}{2} \qquad \text{if} \qquad s=o(p)\ . \tag{69}$$

Using $-\log(1-x) \le x/(1-x)$ for all $x\in[0,1)$ and $\cosh(x)\le\exp(x^2/2)$ for all $x\ge 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_0[L^2] &\le \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\frac{nr^8T^4}{2(1-r^4T^2)^2}\right)\right] \\ &\le \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\frac{nr^8T^4}{2(1-s^2r^4)^2}\right)\right] , \end{aligned} \tag{70}$$

where T is as in Lemma 3, meaning it has the distribution of a sum of K independent Rademacher variables where $K\sim\mathrm{Hyper}(s,s,p)$, and we used the fact that $T\le s$ and $sr^2<1$. Applying Lemma 1, $K\sim\mathbb{E}(W|\mathcal{B})$ where $W\sim\mathrm{Bin}(s,s/p)$ and $\mathcal{B}$ is some suitable σ-algebra. Let V be the sum of W independent Rademacher variables. Consequently, T has the same distribution as $\mathbb{E}[V|\mathcal{B}]$. Then, Jensen's inequality yields

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_0[L^2] \le \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\frac{nr^8V^4}{2(1-s^2r^4)^2}\right)\right] .$$

Let us upper bound the deviations of V. We use Hoeffding's inequality: for a positive integer $k\le s$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[|V|\ge k] &= \sum_{q=k}^s \mathbb{P}[W=q]\,\mathbb{P}[|V|\ge k|W=q] \\ &\le \sum_{q=k}^s \mathbb{P}[W=q]2e^{-\frac{k^2}{2q}} \ \le\ 2\,\mathbb{P}[W\ge k]e^{-\frac{k^2}{2s}} . \end{aligned}$$

If $k/s \geq e^2 s/p$, then we use Lemma 2 to derive

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}[W \geq k] &\leq \exp\left[-sH_{s/p}(k/s)\right] \leq \exp\left[-k\left(\log\left(\frac{kp}{s^2}\right) - 1 + \frac{s^2}{kp}\right)\right] \\ &\leq \exp\left[-\frac{k}{2}\log\left(\frac{kp}{s^2}\right)\right] ,\end{aligned}$$

since $\log(x) - 1 + 1/x \geq \log(x)/2$ when $x \geq e^2$. We have proved that

$$\mathbb{P}[V \geq k] \leq e^{-\frac{k^2}{2s}} \exp\left[-\frac{k}{2}\log\left(\frac{kp}{s^2}\right)\mathbb{1}_{\{kp/s^2 \geq e^2\}}\right] . \tag{71}$$

Define $k_0 := \frac{s^{3/4}}{\log(ep/s)^{1/2}}$ and $k_1 = \frac{s}{\log(ep/s)^{1/2}}$. We decompose the second moment into

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_0[L^2] \leq \mathrm{I} + 2\mathrm{II} + 2\mathrm{III} ,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{I} &:= \exp\left(\frac{nr^8 k_0^4}{2(1-s^2r^4)^2}\right) , \\ \mathrm{II} &:= \sum_{k=\lceil k_0\rceil}^{\lfloor k_1\rfloor} \exp\left(\frac{nr^8 k}{2(1-s^2r^4)^2}\right)\mathbb{P}[V=k] , \\ \mathrm{III} &:= \sum_{k=\lfloor k_1\rfloor+1}^{s} \exp\left(\frac{nr^8 k}{2(1-s^2r^4)^2}\right)\mathbb{P}[V=k]\end{aligned}$$

Relying on (68) and (69), we have

$$\mathrm{I} = \exp\left(\frac{n\kappa^8}{2s\log^2(ep/s)(1-\kappa^4)^2}\right) = 1 + o(1) .$$

Let us now study the two remaining terms depending on the value of s.

CASE A.1: $\log(ep/s) \leq s^{1/4}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{II} &\leq \sum_{k=\lceil k_0\rceil}^{\lfloor k_1\rfloor} \exp\left[\frac{nr^8k^4}{2(1-s^2r^4)^2} - \frac{k^2}{2s}\right] \\ &\leq \sum_{k=\lceil k_0\rceil}^{\lfloor k_1\rfloor} \exp\left[\frac{k^2}{2s}\left(\frac{nr^8sk^2}{(1-\kappa^4)^2} - 1\right)\right] \\ &\leq \sum_{k=\lceil k_0\rceil}^{\lfloor k_1\rfloor} \exp\left[\frac{k^2}{2s}\left(\frac{nr^8s^3}{\log\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right)(1-\kappa^4)^2} - 1\right)\right] \\ &\leq \sum_{k=\lceil k_0\rceil}^{\lfloor k_1\rfloor} \exp\left[-\frac{k^2}{4s}(1+o(1))\right] ,\end{aligned}$$

where we use $k \leq k_1$ in the third line and $\limsup \frac{n\kappa^8}{s\log\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right)(1-\kappa^4)^2} < \limsup \frac{n\kappa^8}{s\log\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right)(1-\kappa^2)^2} < 1/16$ (Conditions (68) and (69)) in the fourth line. Since $k_0^2/s \geq s^{1/4} \to \infty$, the last sum goes to 0

and therefore II $= o(1)$. Observe that $k_1 = s$ if $p = s$, so that we only need to consider III when $s = o(p)$. Applying again (71) and noting that $k_1 p/s^2 \geq p/s \log^{-1/2}(ep/s) \geq e^2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{III} &\leq \sum_{k=\lfloor k_1 \rfloor + 1}^{s} \exp\left[k\left(\frac{nr^8k^3}{2(1-s^2r^4)^2} - \frac{1}{2}\log\left(\frac{pk}{s^2}\right)\right)\right] \\
&\leq \sum_{k=\lfloor k_1 \rfloor + 1}^{s} \exp\left[k\left(\frac{n\kappa^8}{2s(1-\kappa^4)^2} - \frac{1}{2}\log\left(\frac{p}{s}\right) + \frac{1}{4}\log\log\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right)\right)\right] \\
&\leq \sum_{k=\lfloor k_1 \rfloor + 1}^{s} \exp\left[-\frac{k}{4}\log\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right)(1+o(1))\right] = o(1) \ ,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used Condition (69) and $\log\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right) \to \infty$ in the last line.
CASE A.2: $\log(ep/s) > s^{1/4}$. This entails $p/s^2 \to \infty$ and for $k \geq 1$, $\log(s/k) \leq \log(s) = o[\log(ep/s)]$. Applying, as before, (71), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{II} + \text{III} &\leq \sum_{k=\lceil k_0 \rceil}^{s} \exp\left[k\left(\frac{nr^8k^3}{2(1-s^2r^4)^2} - \frac{1}{2}\log\left(\frac{pk}{s^2}\right)\right)\right] \\
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^{s} \exp\left[k\left(\frac{n\kappa^8}{2s(1-\kappa^4)^2} - \frac{1}{2}\log\left(\frac{p}{s}\right) + o\left(\log\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right)\right)\right)\right] \\
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^{s} \exp\left[-\frac{k}{4}\log\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right)(1+o(1))\right] = o(1)
\end{aligned}$$

where we used Condition (69) and $\log\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right) \to \infty$ in the last line.

CASE B: $p \gg n$ if $s = p$ or $\limsup s\log(ep/s)/n \geq c$ if $s = o(p)$, for a numerical constant c. This corresponds to the minimax lower bounds (22) and (24). We assume in the following

$$\frac{\kappa^2}{1-\kappa^2} \ll \exp\left[\frac{p}{64n}\right] \quad \text{if} \quad s = p \ , \tag{72}$$

$$\limsup \frac{\kappa^2}{1-\kappa^2} \exp\left[-\frac{s\log(p/s)}{8n}\right] < 1 \quad \text{if} \quad s = o(p) \ . \tag{73}$$

We again wield Lemma 3 to control the $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_0[L^2]$. We use $\cosh(x) \leq \exp(x)$, valid for all $x \geq 0$, to derive

$$\exp\left[\frac{-nr^4T^2}{1-r^4T^2}\right]\cosh^n\left[\frac{r^2T}{1-r^4T^2}\right] \leq \exp\left[\frac{nr^2T}{1+r^2T}\right] \leq e^{nr^2T}$$

Coming back to (67) and relying on the same bound that got us (70) , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_0[L^2] &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\frac{nr^8T^4}{2(1-r^4T^2)^2}\right)\mathbb{1}_{\{|T|\leq s/2\}}\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\left(1-r^4T^2\right)^{-n/2} e^{nr^2T}\mathbb{1}_{\{|T|\geq s/2\}}\right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}\left[e^{nr^8T^4}\right] + (1-\kappa^4)^{-n/2}\,\mathbb{P}^{1/2}[|T| \geq s/2]\,\mathbb{E}^{1/2}\left[e^{2nr^2T}\right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}\left[e^{nr^8V^4}\right] + \text{IV} \ , \quad \text{IV} := (1-\kappa^4)^{-n/2}\,\mathbb{P}^{1/2}[|T| \geq s/2]\,\mathbb{E}^{1/2}\left[e^{2nr^2V}\right] \ ,
\end{aligned} \tag{74}$$

where in the second line we use fact that $\kappa < 1$, which in particular implies $1 - r^4T^2 \geq 3/4$ when $T \leq s/2$, and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, and in the third line we used Jensen inequality with $T \sim \mathbb{E}[V|\mathcal{B}]$, where the σ-algebra $\mathcal{B}$ is as in CASE A above.

Arguing exactly as in Case A, we have $\mathbb{E}[e^{nr^8V^4}] = 1 + o(1)$ if $\kappa^2 \ll (p/n)^{1/4}$ (for $p = s$) or if $\kappa^2 \leq C(s\log(p/s)/n)^{1/4}$. Consequently, we have $\mathbb{E}[e^{nr^8V^4}] = 1 + o(1)$ for any $\kappa^2 \leq 1$ if either $p/n \to \infty$ or $s\log(p/s)/n$ is large compared to one.

It therefore suffices to prove that IV $= o(1)$. First,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{2nr^2V}\right] = \left(1 + \frac{s}{p}(\cosh(2nr^2) - 1)\right)^s \leq \exp\left[\frac{s^2}{p}(\cosh(2n/s) - 1)\right] , \tag{75}$$

since $\kappa^2 = sr^2 \leq 1$.

CASE B.1: $s = p$. Then, T follows the distribution of a sum of p independent Rademacher variables. By Hoeffding inequality,

$$P\left[|T| \geq \frac{s}{2}\right] \leq 2e^{-p/16} .$$

Since we assume that $n/p = o(1)$, we have $\cosh(2n/p) - 1 \leq 1/32$ eventually, which with (75) then implies that

$$\text{IV} \leq 2(1 - \kappa^4)^{-n/2}e^{-p/64} ,$$

which goes to zero by Condition (72).

CASE B.2: $s = o(p)$. Then, $|T|$ is stochastically upper bounded by a binomial distribution with parameter $(s, s/(p-s))$. Applying Chernoff inequality (Lemma 2), we derive

$$\begin{aligned} P\left[|T| \geq \frac{s}{2}\right] &\leq \exp\left[-sH_{s/(p-s)}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)\right] \\ &\leq \exp\left[-\frac{s}{2}\left\{\log\left(\frac{p-s}{2s}\right) - 1 + \frac{2s}{p-s}\right\}\right] \\ &\leq \exp\left[-\frac{s}{2}\left\{\log\left(\frac{p}{s}\right) + O(1)\right\}\right] . \end{aligned}$$

Combining this upper bound with (75), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{IV} &\leq (1 - \kappa^4)^{-n/2}\exp\left[-\frac{s}{4}\left\{\log\left(\frac{p}{s}\right) + O(1) - \frac{2s}{p}e^{2n/s}\right\}\right] \\ &\leq (1 - \kappa^4)^{-n/2}\exp\left[-\frac{s}{4}\left\{\log\left(\frac{p}{s}\right) + O(1)\right\}\right] \\ &= o(1) , \end{aligned}$$

where we use in the second line $\limsup s\log(p/s)/n \geq c$ for some numerical constant $c > 0$ and Condition (73) in the last line.

6.2.1 Proof of Lemma 3

We start from (66):

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_0[L^2] = \frac{e^{-\frac{n\kappa^2}{1-\kappa^2}}}{(1-\kappa^2)^n}\frac{1}{\binom{p}{s}^2 2^{2s+2n}}\sum_{S,\bar{S}}\sum_{\gamma\in\mathbb{H}^S,\bar{\gamma}\in\mathbb{H}^{\bar{S}}}\sum_{\eta,\bar{\eta}}\prod_{i=1}^{n}\Xi_i ,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\Xi_i &:= \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_0 \exp\left[-\frac{r^2\langle X_{i,S},\gamma\rangle^2}{2(1-\kappa^2)} + \frac{r}{1-\kappa^2}\eta_i\langle X_{i,S},\gamma\rangle - \frac{r^2\langle X_{i,\bar{S}},\bar{\gamma}\rangle^2}{2(1-\kappa^2)} + \frac{r}{1-\kappa^2}\bar{\eta}_i\langle X_{i,\bar{S}},\bar{\gamma}\rangle\right] \\ &= \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_0 \exp\left[-\frac{\kappa^2}{2(1-\kappa^2)}V_i^2 + \frac{\kappa}{1-\kappa^2}V_i - \frac{\kappa^2}{2(1-\kappa^2)}\bar{V}_i^2 + \frac{\kappa}{1-\kappa^2}\bar{V}_i\right] ,\end{aligned}$$

where $V_i := \frac{\eta_i}{\sqrt{s}}\langle X_{i,S},\gamma\rangle$ and $\bar{V}_i := \frac{\bar{\eta}_i}{\sqrt{s}}\langle X_{i,\bar{S}},\bar{\gamma}\rangle$. Fix $S,\bar{S}$ and $i\in[n]$, and let $\alpha_i = \frac{1}{s}\eta_i\bar{\eta}_i\sum_{j\in S\cap\bar{S}}\gamma_j\bar{\gamma}_j$, and then U_i such that $\bar{V}_i = \alpha_i V_i + \sqrt{1-\alpha_i^2}U_i$. Observe that U_i and V_i are iid standard normal. We use the fact that, for $Z\sim\mathcal{N}(0,1)$ and any $a<1/2$ and $b\in\mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp(aZ^2+bZ)] = (1-2a)^{-1/2}\exp[b^2/(2-4a)] ,$$

to derive

$$\begin{aligned}\Xi_i &= \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_0 \exp\left[-\frac{\kappa^2}{2(1-\kappa^2)}(V_i^2 + (\alpha_i V_i + \sqrt{1-\alpha_i^2}U_i)^2) + \frac{\kappa}{1-\kappa^2}(V_i + \alpha_i V_i + \sqrt{1-\alpha_i^2}U_i)\right] \\ &= \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_0 \exp\left[-\frac{\kappa^2(1-\alpha_i^2)}{2(1-\kappa^2)}U_i^2 + \frac{\kappa\sqrt{1-\alpha_i^2}}{1-\kappa^2}(1-\kappa\alpha_i V_i)U_i - \frac{\kappa^2(1+\alpha_i^2)}{2(1-\kappa^2)}V_i^2 + \frac{\kappa(1+\alpha_i)}{1-\kappa^2}V_i\right] \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{1-\kappa^2}{1-\kappa^2\alpha_i^2}}\,\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_0 \exp\left[\frac{\kappa^2(1-\alpha_i^2)\,(1-\kappa\alpha_i V_i)^2}{2(1-\kappa^2)(1-\kappa^2\alpha_i^2)} - \frac{\kappa^2(1+\alpha_i^2)}{2(1-\kappa^2)}V_i^2 + \frac{\kappa(1+\alpha_i)}{1-\kappa^2}V_i\right] \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{1-\kappa^2}{1-\kappa^2\alpha_i^2}}\,e^{\frac{\kappa^2(1-\alpha_i^2)}{2(1-\kappa^2)(1-\kappa^2\alpha_i^2)}}\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_0 \exp\left[-\frac{\kappa^2(1+\alpha_i^2-2\kappa^2\alpha_i^2)}{2(1-\kappa^2)(1-\kappa^2\alpha_i^2)}V_i^2 + \frac{\kappa(1+\alpha_i)(1-\kappa^2\alpha_i)}{(1-\kappa^2)(1-\kappa^2\alpha_i^2)}V_i\right] \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{1-\kappa^2}{1-\kappa^2\alpha_i^2}}\,e^{\frac{\kappa^2(1-\alpha_i^2)}{2(1-\kappa^2)(1-\kappa^2\alpha_i^2)}}\sqrt{\frac{(1-\kappa^2)(1-\kappa^2\alpha_i^2)}{1-\kappa^4\alpha_i^2}}\,e^{\frac{\kappa^2(1+\alpha_i)^2(1-\kappa^2\alpha_i)^2}{2(1-\kappa^2)(1-\kappa^2\alpha_i^2)(1-\kappa^4\alpha_i^2)}} . \\ &= \frac{1-\kappa^2}{\sqrt{1-\kappa^4\alpha_i^2}}\exp\left[\frac{\kappa^2(1-\kappa^2\alpha_i^2)}{(1-\kappa^2)(1-\kappa^4\alpha_i^2)} + \frac{\kappa^2\alpha_i}{1-\kappa^4\alpha_i^2}\right]\end{aligned}$$

Gathering this expression with the definition of $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_0[L^2]$ and defining $U' = \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_i\bar{\eta}_i$ which is distributed as the sum of n independent Rademacher random variables, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_0[L^2] &= \mathbb{E}_{\alpha,U'}\left[\left[1-\kappa^4\alpha^2\right]^{-n/2}\exp\left[\frac{-n\kappa^4\alpha^2}{1-\kappa^4\alpha^2} + \frac{r^2U's\alpha}{1-\kappa^4\alpha^2}\right]\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\alpha}\left[\left[1-\kappa^4\alpha^2\right]^{-n/2}\exp\left[\frac{-n\kappa^4\alpha^2}{1-\kappa^4\alpha^2}\right]\cosh^n\left[\frac{\kappa^2\alpha}{1-\kappa^4\alpha^2}\right]\right] .\end{aligned}$$

Observing that $s\alpha$ follows the distribution of a sum of K independent Rademacher variables where K is an Hypergeometric random variable with parameters (p,s,s) conclude the proof.

6.3 Proof of Propositions 9

Fix some mixing weights $\nu\in(0,1/2)$. We prove simultaneously both propositions ($s=p$ and $s=o(p)$) following closely the arguments of Section 6.2. We use the same prior ϱ and almost notation, except that here $\mathbf{\Sigma}_\mu = \mathbf{I} - \nu(1-\nu)\mu\mu^\top$ and

$$\tilde{H}_0 : X\sim\mathcal{N}(0,\mathbf{I}) \qquad \tilde{H}_1 : X = \xi\mu + \mathbf{\Sigma}_\mu^{1/2}Z\ ,\ \mu\sim\varrho,\ Z\sim\mathcal{N}(0,1)\ ,$$

where ξ is a variable taking values in $\{-\nu, 1-\nu\}$ with probability $1-\nu$ and ν, respectively. Observe that $\Delta\mu = \mu$ and $\frac{\|\mu\|^4}{\mu^\top \mathbf{\Sigma}_\mu \mu} = \mu^\top \mathbf{\Sigma}_\mu^{-1}\mu = \frac{\kappa^2 \nu^{-1}(1-\nu)^{-1}}{1-\kappa^2}$ with $\kappa^2 := \nu(1-\nu)sr^2 < 1$. Denote, as before, $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_0$ (resp. $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_1$) the distribution of the sample under $\tilde{H}_0$ (resp. $\tilde{H}_1$), $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_0$ the expectation with respect to $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_0$. Defining the likelihood ratio $L := d\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_1/d\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_0$, all tests are asymptotically powerless if $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_0[L^2] \to 1$. Thus, it suffices to prove that $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_0[L^2] \to 1$ when $s = o(p)$ and $\kappa^2/(1-\kappa^2) \le c\zeta^{1/3}$ for a sufficiently small constant c, or when $s = p$ and $\kappa^2/(1-\kappa^2) \ll (p/n)^{1/3}$.

Given $\gamma \in \mathbb{H}^S$ and $r > 0$, denote $\mathbf{\Sigma}_{r,\gamma}$ the covariance matrix $\mathbf{\Sigma}_\mu$ with $\mu = r\gamma$. Noting that, for any $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^p$, we have

$$a^\top \mathbf{\Sigma}_\mu^{-1} b = (a^\top b) + \nu(1-\nu)\frac{(a^\top \mu)(b^\top \mu)}{1-\kappa^2} \ ,$$

we express the likelihood ratio L as

$$\begin{aligned} L &= \frac{(1-\kappa^2)^{-n/2}}{\binom{p}{s}2^s} \sum_S \sum_{\gamma \in \mathbb{H}^S} \sum_\eta \prod_{i=1}^n \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_0[\xi = \eta_i] \frac{e^{-\frac{(X_{i,S}-\eta_i r\gamma)^\top \mathbf{\Sigma}_{r,\gamma}^{-1}(X_{i,S}-\eta_i r\gamma)}{2}}}{e^{-\frac{\|X_{i,S}\|^2}{2}}} \\ &= \frac{(1-\kappa^2)^{-n/2}}{\binom{p}{s}2^s} \sum_S \sum_{\gamma \in \mathbb{H}^S} \sum_\eta \prod_{i=1}^n \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_0[\xi = \eta_i] e^{-\frac{\eta_i^2 sr^2}{2(1-\kappa^2)}} e^{-\frac{\kappa^2}{2(1-\kappa^2)}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{s}}\langle X_{i,S},\gamma\rangle\right)^2} e^{\frac{r}{1-\kappa^2}\eta_i \langle X_{i,S},\gamma\rangle} \ , \end{aligned}$$

where the sum is over $S \subset [p]$ of size $|S| = s$ and over $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n) \in \{-\nu, 1-\nu\}^n$. Turning to the second moment, we use the same approach as in Lemma 3. After some tedious computations, we obtain the following formula. Let T be distributed a sum of K independent Rademacher variables, where K is an hypergeometric random variable with parameters (s, s, p). We have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_0[L^2] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\left[1-\kappa^4 T^2/s^2\right]^{-n/2} U^n\right] \ , \\ U &:= (1-\nu)^2 e^{-\frac{\nu\kappa^4 T^2}{(1-\nu)s^2(1-\kappa^4T^2/s^2)} + \frac{\kappa^2 \nu T}{s(1-\nu)(1-\kappa^4T^2/s^2)}} + \nu^2 e^{-\frac{(1-\nu)\kappa^4T^2}{\nu s^2(1-\kappa^2T^4/s^2)} + \frac{\kappa^2(1-\nu)T}{s\nu(1-\kappa^4T^2/s^2)}} \\ &\quad + 2\nu(1-\nu) e^{(1-\frac{1}{2\nu(1-\nu)})\frac{\kappa^4T^2}{s^2(1-\kappa^4T^2/s^2)} - \frac{\kappa^2 T}{s(1-\kappa^4T/s^2)}} \ . \end{aligned}$$

By assumption, $\kappa = o(1)$ so that we can upper bound U using Taylor formula: for n large enough

$$U \le 1 - \frac{1}{2}\kappa^4 \frac{T^2}{s^2} + C\kappa^6 \frac{|T|^3}{s^3} \ ,$$

where C is a positive constant that does not depend on T (but depends on ν). Relying again on a Taylor development of $[1-\kappa^4T^2/s^2]^{-1/2}$, we conclude that

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_0[L^2] \le \mathbb{E}\left[\left(1 + C\kappa^6\frac{|T|^3}{s^3}\right)^n\right] \le \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(Cn\kappa^6\frac{|T|^3}{s^3}\right)\right] \ .$$

Using the same comparison argument as in Section 6.2 leads to

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_0[L^2] \le \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(Cn\kappa^6\frac{|V|^3}{s^3}\right)\right] \ ,$$

where W is a binomial random variable with parameters $(s, s/p)$ and V is the sum of W independent Rademacher variables. Define $k_0 := \frac{s^{2/3}}{\log(ep/s)^{2/3}}$ and $k_1 = \frac{s}{\log(ep/s)}$. Note that k_0 and k_1 are slightly different from Section 6.2. We decompose the second moment into the sum

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_0[L^2] \le \mathrm{I} + 2\cdot\mathrm{II} + 2\cdot\mathrm{III},$$

where

$$\mathrm{I} := \exp\left(Cn\kappa^6 \frac{k_0^3}{s^3}\right) , \qquad \mathrm{II} := \sum_{k=\lceil k_0 \rceil}^{\lfloor k_1 \rfloor} \exp\left(Cn\kappa^6 \frac{k^3}{s^3}\right) \mathbb{P}[V=k] ,$$

and

$$\mathrm{III} := \sum_{k=\lfloor k_1 \rfloor + 1}^{s} \exp\left(Cn\kappa^6 \frac{k^3}{s^3}\right) \mathbb{P}[V=k] .$$

Considering separately the case $\log(ep/s) \le s^{1/8}$ and $\log(ep/s) \ge s^{1/8}$ and following closely the arguments given in Section 6.2, we prove again that $\mathrm{I} = 1 + o(1)$, $\mathrm{II} = o(1)$ and $\mathrm{III} = o(1)$.

6.4 Proof of Proposition 8

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\Delta\mu = (r, 0, \dots, 0)$ for some positive number $r > 0$. As in the previous proofs, we reduce the composite alternative to a simple alternative by putting a prior on $\mathbf{\Sigma}$. Given $t \in (0,1)$ and a unit vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^p$, define the covariance $\mathbf{\Sigma}_{t,v} := \mathbf{I} - tvv^\top$. In this section, we let ϱ denote the uniform distribution over $\big\{-\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}}\big\}^p$. We use it as a prior to reduce the testing problem to

$$H_0^\dagger : X \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}) \qquad \tilde{H}_1^\dagger : X \sim \tfrac{1}{2}\mathcal{N}(-\tfrac{1}{2}\Delta\mu, \mathbf{\Sigma}_{t,v}) + \tfrac{1}{2}\mathcal{N}(\tfrac{1}{2}\Delta\mu, \mathbf{\Sigma}_{t,v}) \ , \ v \sim \varrho \ .$$

Observe that

$$\Delta\mu^\top \mathbf{\Sigma}_\mu^{-1} \Delta\mu = r^2 \left[1 + \frac{t}{p(1-t)}\right] . \tag{76}$$

Let $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_0$ denote the distribution of the sample under $H_0^\dagger$ and $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_{r,t}$ its distribution under $\tilde{H}_1^\dagger$; moreover, let $\bar{\mathbb{P}}_{r,t}$ be its distribution when $X \sim \mathcal{N}(\frac{1}{2}\Delta\mu, \mathbf{\Sigma}_{t,v})$ with $v \sim \varrho$. Observe that $\bar{\mathbb{P}}_{0,0} = \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_0$.

Let $\|\cdot\|_{\mathrm{TV}}$ denote the total variation metric. We claim that

$$\|\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_0 - \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_{r,t}\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \le \|\bar{\mathbb{P}}_{0,0} - \bar{\mathbb{P}}_{r,t}\|_{\mathrm{TV}} . \tag{77}$$

We start by noticing that, if $(X_1, \dots, X_n) \sim \bar{\mathbb{P}}_{r,t}$, and $\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n$ are iid Rademacher variables, independent of $X_1, \dots, X_n$, then $(\epsilon_1 X_1, \dots, \epsilon_n X_n) \sim \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_{r,t}$. Let $\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon$ denote the distribution of $(\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n)$. We then have

$$\|\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_0 - \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_{r,t}\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \le \|\bar{\mathbb{P}}_0 \otimes \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon - \bar{\mathbb{P}}_{r,t} \otimes \mathbb{P}_\varepsilon\|_{\mathrm{TV}} = \|\bar{\mathbb{P}}_0 - \bar{\mathbb{P}}_{r,t}\|_{\mathrm{TV}} ,$$

where the equality is by simple integration with respect to $\mathbb{P}_\varepsilon$, and the inequality is due to the following contraction property of the total variation metric.

Lemma 4. *Consider two probability spaces $(S, \mathcal{A})$ and $(T, \mathcal{B})$. Suppose $\mathbb{P}_1$ and $\mathbb{P}_2$ are probability distributions on $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A})$, and that $g : \mathcal{S} \to \mathcal{T}$ is a measurable function. Then*

$$\|g \circ \mathbb{P}_1 - g \circ \mathbb{P}_2\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \le \|\mathbb{P}_1 - \mathbb{P}_2\|_{\mathrm{TV}} .$$

Proof. By definition,

$$\|g \circ \mathbb{P}_1 - g \circ \mathbb{P}_2\|_{\mathrm{TV}} = \sup_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \big|\mathbb{P}_1(g^{-1}(B)) - \mathbb{P}_2(g^{-1}(B)\big| \le \sup_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \big|\mathbb{P}_1(A) - \mathbb{P}_2(A)\big| = \|\mathbb{P}_1 - \mathbb{P}_2\|_{\mathrm{TV}} .$$

□

Then, by the triangle inequality and then translation invariance,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\bar{\mathbb{P}}_{0,0} - \bar{\mathbb{P}}_{r,t}\|_{\mathrm{TV}} &\leq \|\bar{\mathbb{P}}_{0,0} - \bar{\mathbb{P}}_{r,0}\|_{\mathrm{TV}} + \|\bar{\mathbb{P}}_{r,0} - \bar{\mathbb{P}}_{r,t}\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \\ &\leq \|\bar{\mathbb{P}}_{0,0} - \bar{\mathbb{P}}_{r,0}\|_{\mathrm{TV}} + \|\bar{\mathbb{P}}_{0,0} - \bar{\mathbb{P}}_{0,t}\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \ .\end{aligned}$$

The first total variation distance in the last line is between two isotropic Gaussian distributions with different means. Some calculations and an application of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality lead to

$$\|\bar{\mathbb{P}}_{0,0} - \bar{\mathbb{P}}_{r,0}\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \leq (e^{r^2 n/4} - 1)^{1/2} \ ,$$

which goes to zero if $r = o(1/\sqrt{n})$.

For the second total variation distance, we have the following.

Lemma 5. *If $p \gg n$ and $(1-t)^{-1} \leq e^{p/(2n)}$, then $\|\bar{\mathbb{P}}_{0,0} - \bar{\mathbb{P}}_{0,t}\|_{\mathrm{TV}} = o(1)$.*

In conclusion, as long as $r = o(1/\sqrt{n})$ and $(1-t)^{-1} \leq e^{p/(2n)}$, then no test is able to distinguish $H_0^\dagger$ and $\tilde{H}_1^\dagger$. Translating these bounds in terms of the Mahalanobis distance (76) leads to the desired result.

6.4.1 Proof of Lemma 5

As usual, we use Cauchy-Schwarz inequality to get $\|\bar{\mathbb{P}}_{0,0} - \bar{\mathbb{P}}_{0,t}\|_{\mathrm{TV}}^2 \leq \mathbb{E}_0[L_t^2] - 1$, where L_t is the likelihood of $\bar{\mathbb{P}}_{0,t}$ with respect to $\bar{\mathbb{P}}_{0,0}$, and $\mathbb{E}_0$ denotes the expectation with respect to $\bar{\mathbb{P}}_{0,0}$. This likelihood writes as

$$\begin{aligned}L_t &= \frac{1}{2^p} \sum_{\eta \in \{-1,1\}^p} \frac{1}{(1-t)^{n/2}} \exp\left[-\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{2} X_i^\top \left\{ \left(\mathbf{I} - \frac{t}{p} \eta\eta^\top \right)^{-1} - \mathbf{I} \right\} X_i \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2^p} \sum_{\eta \in \{-1,1\}^p} \frac{1}{(1-t)^{n/2}} \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2} \frac{t}{p(1-t)} \sum_{i=1}^n (\eta^\top X_i)^2 \right] \ .\end{aligned}$$

Thus, its second moment equals

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_0[L_t^2] &= \frac{1}{(1-t)^n} \frac{1}{2^{2p}} \sum_{\eta,\bar{\eta} \in \{1,1\}^p} \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_0 \left[\exp\left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \frac{t}{p(1-t)} \left((\eta^\top X_i)^2 + (\bar{\eta}^\top X_i)^2 \right) \right\} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2^{2p}} \sum_{\eta,\bar{\eta} \in \{-1,1\}^p} \left(1 - \frac{t^2}{p^2} (\eta^\top \bar{\eta})^2 \right)^{-n/2} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\left(1 - \frac{t^2}{p^2} W^2 \right)^{-n/2} \right] \ ,\end{aligned}$$

where W is distributed like a sum of p independent Rademacher variables. Since we assume that $p \gg n$, there exists a sequence u_n going to infinity such that $n u_n^2 = o(p)$. We decompose the expectation into a sum of three terms

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\left(1 - \frac{t^2}{p^2} W^2 \right)^{-n/2} \right] &\leq \left(1 - \frac{u_n^2}{p} \right)^{-n/2} + 2 \sum_{k=\lfloor \sqrt{p} u_n \rfloor}^{\lfloor p/2 \rfloor} \frac{\mathbb{P}[W=k]}{(1 - k^2/p^2)^{n/2}} + 2 \frac{\mathbb{P}[W \geq p/2]}{(1-t^2)^{n/2}} \\ &=: A_1 + A_2 + A_3 \ .\end{aligned}$$

Since $nu_n^2/p = o(1)$, $A_1 = 1 + o(1)$. By Hoeffing inequality, $\mathbb{P}[W \geq k] \leq e^{-2k^2/p}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} A_2 &\leq 2 \sum_{k=\lfloor \sqrt{p} u_n \rfloor}^{\lfloor p/2 \rfloor} \exp\left[-2\frac{k^2}{p} - \frac{n}{2} \log\left(1 - \frac{k^2}{p^2}\right)\right] \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{k=\lfloor \sqrt{p} u_n \rfloor}^{\lfloor p/2 \rfloor} \exp\left[-\frac{k^2}{p}\left(2 - \frac{n}{2p(1-k^2/p^2)}\right)\right] \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{k=\lfloor \sqrt{p} u_n \rfloor}^{\lfloor p/2 \rfloor} \exp\left[-\frac{k^2}{p}\left(2 - \frac{4n}{3p}\right)\right] = o(1) \ , \end{aligned}$$

where in the second line we used $-\log(1-x) \leq x/(1-x)$ for all $x \in (0,1)$, and in the third line we used $k \leq p/2$, $n = o(p)$ and $k^2/p \geq u_n^2 \to \infty$. Finally, applying Hoeffding's inequality once again, we get

$$A_3 \leq 2 \exp\left[-\frac{p}{2} - \frac{n}{2} \log(1-t^2)\right] \ ,$$

which goes to zero since we assume that $(1-t)^{-1} \leq e^{p/(2n)}$.

7 Proofs: upper bounds

As in the previous notation, we use the notation $\zeta = \frac{s}{n}\log(ep/s)$ introduced in (59). Define the standardized observations:

$$X_{\ddagger i} = \mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1/2} X_i = \eta_i \Delta\mu_{\ddagger 0} + (1-\eta_i)\Delta\mu_{\ddagger 1} + Z_i \ , \tag{78}$$

based on (4), where $\mu_{\ddagger k} = \mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1/2}\mu_k, k = 0, 1$. Define the corresponding sample mean and sample covariance matrix:

$$\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_\ddagger := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n (X_{\ddagger i} - \bar{X}_\ddagger)(X_{\ddagger i} - \bar{X}_\ddagger)^\top, \quad \bar{X}_\ddagger := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n X_{\ddagger i} \ .$$

Note that

$$X_{\ddagger i} - \bar{X}_\ddagger = Z_i - \bar{Z} - (\eta_i - \bar{\eta})\Delta\mu_\ddagger \ ,$$

where $\bar{\eta} := \frac{1}{n}\sum_i \eta_i$ and $\Delta\mu_\ddagger := \Delta\mu_{\ddagger 1} - \Delta\mu_{\ddagger 0} = \mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1/2}\Delta\mu$.

The following concentration bounds will be useful to us.

Lemma 6. *Birgé (2001) Let X be a non central χ^2 variable with D degrees of freedom and a non centrality parameter B, then for all $x > 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left[X \leq (D+B) - 2\sqrt{(D+2B)x}\right] &\leq e^{-x} \\ \mathbb{P}\left[X \geq (D+B) + 2\sqrt{(D+2B)x} + 2x\right] &\leq e^{-x} \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 7. *Davidson and Szarek (2001) Let $\mathbf{W}$ be a standard Wishart matrix of parameters (n, d) with $n > d$. For any number $0 < x < 1$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left[\lambda^{\max}(\mathbf{W}) \geq n\left(1 + \sqrt{d/n} + \sqrt{2x/n}\right)^2\right] &\leq e^{-x} \ , \\ \mathbb{P}\left[\lambda^{\min}(\mathbf{W}) \leq n\left(1 - \sqrt{d/n} - \sqrt{2x/n}\right)_+^2\right] &\leq e^{-x} \ . \end{aligned}$$

7.1 Proof of Proposition 2

Since $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is known, we may assume that $\mathbf{\Sigma} = \mathbf{I}$ by working with the standardized observations (78).

7.1.1 Under H_0

Under the null hypothesis, we control $\hat{\lambda}_{\mathbf{\Sigma}}^{\max}$ by applying Lemma 7, to get

$$\mathbb{P}_0\left[\hat{\lambda}_{\mathbf{\Sigma}}^{\max} \geq \left(1+\sqrt{p/n}+\sqrt{2x/n}\right)^2\right] \leq \exp(-x) \ .$$

Taking $x = n \wedge p$, leads to

$$\hat{\lambda}_{\mathbf{\Sigma}}^{\max} \leq 1 + \frac{p}{n} + 12\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} \ , \tag{79}$$

with probability larger than $1 - e^{-p\wedge n}$.

7.1.2 Under H_1

In this section, C refers to the constant in Condition (16). We now turn to the alternative hypothesis. Let $\mathbf{X}$ denote the data matrix, meaning the $n \times p$ matrix with rows the X_i's. Define $\mathbf{Z}$ similarly.

CASE 1: $p > n$**.** We have

$$\hat{\lambda}_{\mathbf{\Sigma}}^{\max} \geq \frac{\|\mathbf{W}v_1\|^2}{n} \ ,$$

where $\mathbf{W} = (\mathbf{I} - \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{J})\mathbf{X}$, with $\mathbf{J}$ being the matrix with all 1's, and $v_1 := \kappa\omega + \sqrt{1-\kappa^2}\, t_1$, with

$$\omega := \frac{\Delta\mu}{\|\Delta\mu\|}, \quad t_1 := \underset{\|t\|=1,\, \langle t,\omega\rangle = 0}{\arg\max} \langle \mathbf{W}t, \mathbf{W}\omega\rangle, \quad \kappa := \frac{\langle \mathbf{W}\omega, \mathbf{W}t_1\rangle}{\|\mathbf{W}t_1\|^2} \wedge \frac{1}{4} \ .$$

Note that here the simple lower bound $\hat{\lambda}_{\mathbf{\Sigma}}^{\max} \geq \|\mathbf{W}\omega\|^2/n$ does not yield the right performances. We prove below that

Lemma 8. *We have*

$$\hat{\lambda}_{\mathbf{\Sigma}}^{\max} \geq \frac{\|\mathbf{W}t_1\|^2}{n} + \frac{1}{5}\left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{W}\omega, \mathbf{W}t_1\rangle}{n} \wedge \frac{\langle \mathbf{W}\omega, \mathbf{W}t_1\rangle^2}{n\|\mathbf{W}t_1\|^2}\right) \ . \tag{80}$$

In view of (80), we need to control $\|\mathbf{W}t_1\|$ and $\langle \mathbf{W}\omega, \mathbf{W}t_1\rangle$. By definition of $\mathbf{W}$, we have

$$\langle \mathbf{W}\omega, \mathbf{W}t_1\rangle = \max_{t:\, \|t\|=1,\, \langle t,\omega\rangle = 0} \langle (\mathbf{I} - \tfrac{1}{n}\mathbf{J})\mathbf{X}\omega, \mathbf{X}t\rangle \ .$$

By Cochran's theorem, $(\mathbf{X}t : \langle t, \omega\rangle = 0)$ is independent of $\mathbf{X}\omega$, so that upon a change of basis we have

$$\langle \mathbf{W}\omega, \mathbf{W}t_1\rangle = \max_{t\in\mathbb{R}^{p-1},\, \|t\|=1} \langle (\mathbf{I} - \tfrac{1}{n}\mathbf{J})\mathbf{X}\omega, \mathbf{U}t\rangle = \|\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{W}\omega\| \ ,$$

where the entries of $n \times (p-1)$ matrix $\mathbf{U}$ are iid standard normal and independent of $\mathbf{X}\omega$. Thus, conditionally to $\mathbf{W}\omega$,

$$T^2 := \frac{\langle \mathbf{W}t_1, \mathbf{W}\omega\rangle^2}{\|\mathbf{W}\omega\|^2} = \frac{\|\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{W}\omega\|^2}{\|\mathbf{W}\omega\|^2} \sim \chi^2_{p-1} \ . \tag{81}$$

We have

$$\mathbf{W}\omega = (\mathbf{I} - \tfrac{1}{n}\mathbf{J})\big(\mathbf{1}\mu_0^\top + (\mathbf{1}-\eta)\Delta\mu^\top + \mathbf{Z}\big)\frac{\Delta\mu}{\|\Delta\mu\|} = (\mathbf{I} - \tfrac{1}{n}\mathbf{J})\mathbf{Z}\omega - (\mathbf{I} - \tfrac{1}{n}\mathbf{J})\eta\|\Delta\mu\| \ ,$$

so that, conditional on $\eta = (\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_n)$, $\|\mathbf{W}\omega\|^2$ follows a non-central χ^2 distribution with $n-1$ degrees of freedom and non-centrality parameter

$$B := \sum_{i=1}^n (\eta_i - \bar\eta)^2 \|\Delta\mu\|^2 = n\bar\eta(1-\bar\eta)\|\Delta\mu\|^2 \ , \tag{82}$$

where $\bar\eta := \frac{1}{n}\sum_i \eta_i$. Applying Lemma 6, we get

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\|\mathbf{W}\omega\|^2 \le n - 1 + B - 3\sqrt{(n-1+B)x} \ \middle|\ \eta\right] \le e^{-x} \ . \tag{83}$$

Assume without loss of generality that $\nu \le 1/2$, and define the event

$$\mathcal{A} := \big\{|\bar\eta - \nu| \le \tfrac{1}{2}\nu(1-\nu)\big\} \, . \tag{84}$$

Note that, conditional on $\mathcal{A}$, $\bar\eta(1-\bar\eta) \ge \frac{1}{2}\nu(1-\nu)$. Since $n\bar\eta \sim \mathrm{Bin}(n,\nu)$, by Bernstein's inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\mathcal{A}^c\right] \le 2\exp\left[-\tfrac{n}{10}\nu(1-\nu)\right] \ . \tag{85}$$

Since we assume that (16) hold, conditional on $\mathcal{A}$ we have, for n large enough, $B \ge b := \frac{C}{2}\sqrt{np}$, and from this we derive

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\|\mathbf{W}\omega\|^2 > \tfrac{c}{4}\sqrt{np} \ \middle|\ \mathcal{A}\right] \ge 1 - e^{-(n-1+b)/36} \ , \tag{86}$$

by choosing $x = (n-1+b)/36$. Based on (81), (85) and (86), and Lemma 6, we conclude that, with probability tending to one,

$$\langle \mathbf{W}\omega, \mathbf{W}t_1\rangle^2 \ge \tfrac{C}{5}p\sqrt{np} \ .$$

Let us turn to $\|\mathbf{W}t_1\|^2$. We have the decomposition

$$\|\mathbf{W}t_1\|^2 = T^2 + \max_{u:\, \|u\|=1,\, \langle u, \mathbf{W}\omega\rangle = 0} \langle \mathbf{W}t_1, u\rangle^2 \ .$$

Again by Cochran's theorem,

$$\big(\langle (\mathbf{I} - \tfrac{1}{n}\mathbf{J})\mathbf{X}t, u\rangle : \langle t, \omega\rangle = \langle u, \mathbf{W}\omega\rangle = 0\big) \quad \text{and} \quad \big(\langle (\mathbf{I} - \tfrac{1}{n}\mathbf{J})\mathbf{X}t, \mathbf{W}\omega\rangle : \langle t, \omega\rangle = 0\big) \tag{87}$$

are independent conditionally on $\mathbf{W}\omega$. Since t_1 is a function of the right-hand side of (87), the distribution of the above maximum is the same as if t_1 were fixed, say equal to t. (Note that t is necessarily a unit vector satisfying $\langle t, \omega\rangle = 0$.) Then that maximum is equal to

$$\sup_{u:\, \|u\|=1,\, \langle u, \mathbf{W}\omega\rangle = 0} \langle \mathbf{W}t, u\rangle^2 = \sup_{u:\, \|u\|=1,\, \langle u, \mathbf{W}\omega\rangle = 0} \langle \mathbf{Z}t, (\mathbf{I} - \tfrac{1}{n}\mathbf{J})u\rangle^2 = \|P\mathbf{Z}t\|^2 \ ,$$

where P is the orthogonal projection onto $\mathrm{span}\{\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{W}\omega\}^\perp$, and the first equality comes from

$$\mathbf{W}t = (\mathbf{I} - \tfrac{1}{n}\mathbf{J})\mathbf{X}t = (\mathbf{I} - \tfrac{1}{n}\mathbf{J})\big(\mathbf{1}\mu_0^\top + (\mathbf{1}-\eta)\Delta\mu^\top + \mathbf{Z}\big)t \ ,$$

and the fact that $\langle t, \Delta\mu\rangle = 0$. Since the Z_i's are standard normal and t is normed, $\|P\mathbf{Z}t\|^2$ has the χ^2 distribution with $n-2$ degrees of freedom. Then using (81) and the deviations of the chi-squared distribution (e.g., Lemma 6), we derive that

$$\|\mathbf{W}t_1\|^2 = n + p + O_P(\sqrt{p}) \ .$$

Plugging these bounds into (80), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\lambda}_{\mathbf{\Sigma}}^{\max} &\geq 1 + \frac{p}{n} + O_P(\sqrt{p}/n) + \frac{1}{5n}\left[\left(\frac{C}{5}p\sqrt{np}\right)^{1/2} \wedge \frac{\frac{C}{5}p\sqrt{np}}{n+p+O_P(\sqrt{p})}\right] \\ &\geq 1 + \frac{p}{n} + \frac{1}{5}\left[\left(\frac{C}{5}\right)^{1/2} \wedge \frac{C}{10}\right]\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}}(1+o_P(1)) \ ,\end{aligned}$$

since $p \geq n$. If condition (16) is satisfied for C large enough, then this last quantity is larger than the RHS in (79) with probability going to one. In conclusion, the risk of the test for $p > n$ is smaller than $o(1) + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}^c)$ with $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}^c) = o(1)$ under condition (16).

CASE 2: $p \leq n$**.** Here we simply use the lower bound

$$\hat{\lambda}_{\mathbf{\Sigma}}^{\max} \geq \frac{\|\mathbf{W}\omega\|^2}{n} \ ,$$

and we use (83), and the fact that, conditional on $\mathcal{A}$, we have $B \geq b$, to derive

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\|\mathbf{W}\omega\|^2 > n - 1 + b - 3\sqrt{(n-1+b)x} \mid \mathcal{A}\right] \geq 1 - e^{-x} \ ,$$

when $0 < x \leq \frac{1}{9}(n-1+b)$. Choosing $x = p/9 \to \infty$, and since $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}^c) = o(1)$, with probability tending to 1, we have

$$\hat{\lambda}_{\mathbf{\Sigma}}^{\max} \geq 1 - \frac{1}{n} + \tfrac{C}{2}\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} - 3\sqrt{(1+\tfrac{C}{2})\frac{p}{n}} = 1 - \frac{1}{n} + \left(\tfrac{C}{2} - 3\sqrt{1+\tfrac{C}{2}}\right)\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} \ .$$

When the constant C in Condition (16) is chosen large enough, the RHS here is larger than the RHS in (79), which implies that the test is asymptotically powerful.

7.1.3 Proof of Lemma 8

Suppose that $\kappa < 1/4$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbf{W}v_1\|^2 &= \|\mathbf{W}t_1\|^2 + \kappa^2\|\mathbf{W}\omega\|^2 + (-1+2\sqrt{1-\kappa^2})\frac{\langle \mathbf{W}\omega, \mathbf{W}t_1\rangle^2}{\|\mathbf{W}t_1\|^2} \\ &\geq \|\mathbf{W}t_1\|^2 + b\frac{\langle \mathbf{W}\omega, \mathbf{W}t_1\rangle^2}{\|\mathbf{W}t_1\|^2} \ ,\end{aligned}$$

where $b := (-1+2\sqrt{1-(1/4)^2}) > 4/5$. And when $\kappa = 1/4$, we have $\|\mathbf{W}t_1\|^2 \leq 4\langle \mathbf{W}\omega, \mathbf{W}t_1\rangle$, so that

$$\|\mathbf{W}v_1\|^2 \geq \|\mathbf{W}t_1\|^2 + \left(2\kappa\sqrt{1-\kappa^2} - 4\kappa^2\right)\langle \mathbf{W}\omega, \mathbf{W}t_1\rangle \ ,$$

From this we conclude.

7.2 Proof of Proposition 3

We work again the standardized data (78). Note that

$$\hat{\lambda}^{\max}_{s,\mathbf{\Sigma}} := \max_{\|\mathbf{\Sigma}^{1/2}u\|_0 \le s} \frac{u^\top \hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_\ddagger u}{u^\top u} \ .$$

7.2.1 Under H_0

Under the null hypothesis, $n\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_\ddagger$ follows a Wishart distribution with parameters $(n-1, p)$. Thus, $n\hat{\lambda}^{\max}_{s,\mathbf{\Sigma}}$ is the supremum of $\binom{s}{p}$ largest eigenvalues of Wishart matrices with parameters $(n-1, s)$. Although they are not independent, we may apply the union bound, and then use the deviation bound in Lemma 7 to get

$$\mathbb{P}_0\left[\hat{\lambda}^{\max}_{s,\mathbf{\Sigma}} \le \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{s}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{4s}{n}\log\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right)}\right)^2\right] \le \left(\frac{ep}{s}\right)^{-s} \ .$$

Hence, with probability going to one,

$$\hat{\lambda}^{\max}_{s,\mathbf{\Sigma}} \le 1 + 9\zeta + 6\sqrt{\zeta} \ . \tag{88}$$

7.2.2 Under H_1

In this section, C refers to the universal constant that appears in (17). Under the alternative, we use $u = \mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1/2}\Delta\mu$ to get the lower bound

$$\hat{\lambda}^{\max}_{s,\mathbf{\Sigma}} \ge \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\left[(X_{\ddagger i} - \bar{X}_\ddagger)^\top \mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1/2}\Delta\mu\right]^2}{n\|\mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1/2}\Delta\mu\|^2} := \frac{W}{n} \ ,$$

where

$$W = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \left[(Z_i - \bar{Z})^\top \mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1/2}\Delta\mu - (\eta_i - \bar{\eta})\Delta\mu^\top \mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1}\Delta\mu\right]^2}{\|\mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1/2}\Delta\mu\|^2} \ , \tag{89}$$

and $\bar{\eta} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_i \eta_i$. Since $\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_n, Z_1, \ldots, Z_n$ are independent, given the η_i's, W follows a χ^2 distribution with $n-1$ degrees of freedom with non-centrality parameter $B := n\bar{\eta}(1-\bar{\eta})\|\mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1/2}\Delta\mu\|^2$ as in (82), and by Lemma 6,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[W \ge n - 1 + B - 3\sqrt{(n+B)x} \ \middle|\ \eta\right] \ge 1 - e^{-x} \ ,$$

for any $x > 0$. As in the proof of Proposition 2, when (17) holds we have, for n large enough, that $B \ge b := \frac{C}{2}n(\zeta \vee \sqrt{\zeta})$ under the event $\mathcal{A}$ defined in (84). This gives

$$\mathbb{P}\left[W \ge n - 1 + b - 3\sqrt{(n-1+b)x} \ \middle|\ \mathcal{A}\right] \ge 1 - e^{-x} \ ,$$

as long as $x \le \frac{1}{9}(n-1+b)$. We choose $x = \frac{b^2}{6^2(n+b)} \wedge \frac{1}{9}(n-1+b)$, so that $W \ge n - 1 + b/2$ when the event above holds. Note that $x \to \infty$, and since $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}) \to 1$ by (85), with probability tending to one, we have

$$\hat{\lambda}^{\max}_{s,\mathbf{\Sigma}} \ge 1 - \frac{1}{n} + \frac{C}{4}(\zeta \vee \sqrt{\zeta}) \ . \tag{90}$$

Comparing this lower bound (under the alternative) with upper bound (88) (under the null) concludes the proof.

7.2.3 Variable selection

We continue with the same notation and work with the standardized variables, but now assume that (18) holds. For any $u \in \mathbb{R}^p$,

$$u^\top \hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_\ddagger u = \bar{\eta}(1-\bar{\eta})(u^\top \Delta\mu_\ddagger)^2 - 2(u^\top \Delta\mu_\ddagger)(u^\top Y) + u^\top \hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_Z u \ ,$$

where $Y := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n (\eta_i - \bar{\eta})(Z_i - \bar{Z})$ and $\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_Z$ is the sample covariance of $Z_1, \ldots, Z_n$. Fix $\delta \in (0,1)$ and define

$$\mathcal{U}_\delta = \big\{ u \in \mathbb{R}^p : \|u\| = 1, \|\mathbf{\Sigma}^{1/2} u\|_0 \le s \text{ and } |u^\top \Delta\mu_\ddagger| \le (1-\delta)\|\Delta\mu_\ddagger\| \big\} \ .$$

In particular, any $u \in \mathcal{U}_\delta$ makes an angle of at least $\mathrm{acos}(1-\delta)$ with $\Delta\mu_\ddagger$. Exactly as in (88), we have

$$\max_{u \in \mathcal{U}_\delta} u^\top \hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_Z u \le 1 + 9\zeta + 6\sqrt{\zeta} \ ,$$

with probability going to one. And given $\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_n$, $Y \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \frac{1}{n}\bar{\eta}(1-\bar{\eta})\mathbf{I})$, with $\bar{\eta}(1-\bar{\eta}) \le 1/4$, so that

$$\max_{u \in \mathcal{U}_\delta} |u^\top Y| \ \overset{\text{sto}}{\le} \ \tfrac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}_0} |u^\top Z_0| = \tfrac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \Big(\max_{|S|=s} \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}_S} |u^\top Z_0| \Big) \ ,$$

where $Z_0 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I})$, and for a subset $S \subset [p]$, we define $\mathcal{U}_S = \big\{ u \in \mathbb{R}^p : \|u\| = 1, \mathrm{supp}(\mathbf{\Sigma}^{1/2} u) = S \big\}$. For each subset S of size s, $\max_{u \in \mathcal{U}_S} (u^\top Z_0)^2$ has the chi-squared distribution with s degrees of freedom. Since there are $\binom{p}{s}$ such subsets, a union bound and an application of Lemma 6 yields

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\max_{u \in \mathcal{U}_0} (u^\top Z_0)^2 \ge s + 2\sqrt{sx} + 2x \right] \le e^{s\log(ep/s) - x} \ ,$$

for all $x > 0$, and choosing $x = 2s\log(ep/s)$, we get

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\max_{u \in \mathcal{U}_0} |u^\top Z_0| \ge 3\sqrt{s\log(ep/s)} \right] \le e^{-s\log(ep/s)} = o(1) \ . \tag{91}$$

We also have $\bar{\eta}(1-\bar{\eta}) \le (1+\delta)\nu(1-\nu)$ with probability tending to one, by Chebyshev's inequality. Hence, with probability tending to one,

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}_\delta} u^\top \hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_\ddagger u &\le (1+\delta)\nu(1-\nu)(1-\delta)^2 \|\Delta\mu_\ddagger\|^2 + 2(1-\delta)\|\Delta\mu_\ddagger\| \, 3\sqrt{\zeta} + 1 + 9\zeta + 6\sqrt{\zeta} \\ &\le 1 + (1-\delta)\nu(1-\nu)\|\Delta\mu_\ddagger\|^2 \ , \end{aligned}$$

eventually, using (18) in the second line. (Note that $\|\Delta\mu_\ddagger\|^2 = \Delta\mu^\top \mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1} \Delta\mu$.)

One the other hand, since $\bar{\eta}(1-\bar{\eta}) \ge (1-\delta/3)\nu(1-\nu)$ with probability tending to one, when $u_\star = \Delta\mu_\ddagger / \|\Delta\mu_\ddagger\|$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} u_\star^\top \hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_\ddagger u_\star &\ge (1-\delta/3)\nu(1-\nu)\|\Delta\mu_\ddagger\|^2 - 6(1-\delta)\|\Delta\mu_\ddagger\|\sqrt{\zeta} + 1 - O_P(1/\sqrt{n}) \\ &\ge 1 + (1-\delta/2)\nu(1-\nu)\|\Delta\mu_\ddagger\|^2 \ , \end{aligned} \tag{92}$$

eventually, using (18) again, and using the fact that $u_\star^\top \hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_Z u_\star \sim \frac{1}{n}\chi^2_{n-1}$.

Using these two bounds, with probability tending to one,

$$u_\star^\top \hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_\ddagger u_\star - \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}_\delta} u^\top \hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_\ddagger u \ge \frac{\delta}{6}\nu(1-\nu)\|\Delta\mu_\ddagger\|^2 > 0 \ ,$$

eventually. Let A_δ be that event. We just showed that, for any fixed $\delta > 0$, $\mathbb{P}(A_\delta) \to 1$.

Let $\hat{u}$ be a maximizer of (15) and define $\hat{v} = \mathbf{\Sigma}^{1/2}\hat{u}$. Define $J = \mathrm{supp}(\Delta\mu)$ and $\hat{J} = \mathrm{supp}(\hat{v})$, let $\tau = \max_{j\in J}|\Delta\mu_j| / \min_{j\in J}|\Delta\mu_j|$ denote the effective dynamic range of $\Delta\mu$, and let $\Upsilon = \lambda_{2s}^{\max}(\mathbf{\Sigma})/\lambda_{2s}^{\min}(\mathbf{\Sigma})$ denote the $(2s)$-sparse Riesz constant of $\mathbf{\Sigma}$. Under A_δ, $\hat{u} \notin \mathcal{U}_\delta$, which by definition implies that $|\hat{u}^\top u_\star| \geq (1-\delta)$, which is equivalent to

$$\|\hat{u} - u_\star\|^2 \leq 2 - 2(1-\delta) = 2\delta \ ,$$

since $\hat{u}^*$ and $u_\star$ are both unit vectors. Since $\hat{v}$ and $\Delta\mu = \mathbf{\Sigma}^{1/2}\Delta\mu_\ddagger$ are s sparse,

$$\|\hat{v} - \Delta\mu/\|\Delta\mu_\ddagger\|\|^2 = \|\mathbf{\Sigma}^{1/2}(\hat{u} - u_\star)\|^2 \leq \lambda_{2s}^{\max}(\mathbf{\Sigma})2\delta \ .$$

On the other hand, using again the operator norm, we get

$$\|\hat{v} - \Delta\mu/\|\Delta\mu_\ddagger\|\|^2 \geq \frac{\sum_{j\in J\setminus\hat{J}}\Delta\mu_j^2}{\|\Delta\mu_\ddagger\|^2} \geq \frac{\sum_{j\in J\setminus\hat{J}}\Delta\mu_j^2}{\lambda_{2s}^{\max}(\mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1/2})^2\sum_{j\in J}\Delta\mu_j^2} \geq \lambda_{2s}^{\min}(\mathbf{\Sigma})\frac{|J\setminus\hat{J}|}{|J|}\frac{1}{\tau^2} \ .$$

Since J and $\hat{J}$ are of same size, we have $|\hat{J}\triangle J| = 2|J\setminus\hat{J}|$, and we conclude that, under A_δ, $|\hat{J}\triangle J|/|J| \leq \delta\tau^2\Upsilon$. Since this is true for any fixed $\delta > 0$, and since τ and Υ are bounded, (6) holds and the proof is complete.

7.3 Proof of Proposition 5

Define

$$V = \min_{\|u\|_0\leq s} \frac{n\sum_i\left[u^\top(X_i - \bar{X})\right]^4}{\left(\sum_i\left[u^\top(X_i-\bar{X})\right]^2\right)^2} \ .$$

We work with the standardized data (78), and without loss of generality, we assume that $\mathbb{E}(X) = 0$ always. By a simple change of variables, one may write V as

$$V = \min_{v\in\mathcal{V}} \frac{nQ_4(v)}{Q_2(v)^2} \ ,$$

where

$$Q_2(v) := \sum_i\left[v^\top(X_{\ddagger i} - \bar{X}_\ddagger)\right]^2 \ , \quad Q_4(v) := \sum_i\left[v^\top(X_{\ddagger i} - \bar{X}_\ddagger)\right]^4 \ , \tag{93}$$

and

$$\mathcal{V} := \left\{v : \|v\| = 1,\ \|\mathbf{\Sigma}^{-1/2}v\|_0 \leq s\right\} \ . \tag{94}$$

7.3.1 Under H_0

Suppose we are under the null, so that $X_{\ddagger i} = Z_i$ are iid standard normal. We lower bound V by

$$V \geq \frac{n\min_{v\in\mathcal{V}}Q_4(v)}{\max_{v\in\mathcal{V}}Q_2(v)^2} \ ,$$

and control the numerator and denominator separately.

We first build a net for $\mathcal{V}$. For $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$, let $w_1, \ldots, w_{N_\varepsilon}$ be an ε-net (with respect to the Euclidean metric) of $\mathcal{V}$. Since $\mathcal{V}$ is the union of unit spheres of $\binom{p}{s}$ subspaces of dimension s, we may take

$$N_\varepsilon \leq \binom{p}{s}(1 + 2/\epsilon)^s \tag{95}$$

by (Vershynin, 2010, Lem. 1.2).

We first bound the denominator from above. Since $\mathcal{V}$ is the union of $\binom{p}{s}$ unit balls of subspaces of dimension s, $\max_{v\in\mathcal{V}} Q_2(v)$ is distributed like the maximum of $\binom{p}{s}$ (possibly dependent) largest eigenvalues of Wishart matrices with parameters $(n-1, s)$. Applying the union bound and then Lemma 7, we derive that

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\max_{v\in\mathcal{V}} Q_2(v) \geq (n-1)\big(1+\sqrt{s/(n-1)}+\sqrt{2x/(n-1)}\big)^2\right] \leq \binom{p}{s} e^{-x} \leq e^{s\log(ep/s)-x} \ .$$

for all $x \geq 0$. For $x \geq s \geq 1$, we have

$$(n-1)(1+\sqrt{s/(n-1)}+\sqrt{2x/(n-1)})^2 \leq n + 2\sqrt{ns} + 2\sqrt{2nx} + 6x \ ,$$

so that changing x into $s\log(ep/s)+x$, and using the fact that $\sqrt{a+b} \leq \sqrt{a}+\sqrt{b}$ for all $a, b > 0$, and also that $\zeta \leq 1$, we get

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\min_{v\in\mathcal{V}} Q_2(v) \geq n + 9n\sqrt{\zeta} + 2\sqrt{2nx} + 6x\right] \leq e^{-x} \ , \tag{96}$$

for any $x > 0$.

We now bound the numerator from below, still under the null. We have

$$\inf_{v\in\mathcal{V}} Q_4(v) \geq \inf_{v\in\mathcal{V}} Q_4^\circ(v) - 3\sup_{v\in\mathcal{V}} Q_3^\circ(v) \max_{v\in\mathcal{V}} v^\top \bar{Z} - 2n \max_{v\in\mathcal{V}} (v^\top \bar{Z})^4 \ , \tag{97}$$

where

$$Q_3^\circ(v) := \sum_{i=1}^n (v^\top Z_i)^3 \ , \qquad Q_4^\circ(v) := \sum_{i=1}^n (v^\top Z_i)^4 \ .$$

We have that $n\max_{v\in\mathcal{V}}(v^\top \bar{Z})^2$ is distributed as the maximum of $\binom{p}{s}$ (possibly dependent) χ^2_s random variables. Applying the union bound and then Lemma 6, as above we derive

$$\mathbb{P}\left[n\max_{v\in\mathcal{V}}(v^\top \bar{Z})^2 \geq s + 2\sqrt{sx} + 2x\right] \leq e^{s\log(ep/s)-x} \ ,$$

for all $x > 0$, and choosing $x = 2s\log(ep/s)$, we get

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\max_{v\in\mathcal{V}} |v^\top \bar{Z}| \geq 3\sqrt{\zeta}\right] = o(1) \ . \tag{98}$$

The random variable $Q_3^\circ(v)$ is controlled in (128) (proof of Proposition 10).

To control $Q_4^\circ(v)$, we use a chaining argument together with some deviation inequalities.

Lemma 9. *For any $x > 0$, and any unit vectors v, w, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[Q_4^\circ(v) \leq 3n - C\sqrt{nx}\right] \leq x^{-1} \ , \tag{99}$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}\left[|Q_4^\circ(v) - Q_4^\circ(w)| \geq \|v-w\| C_1\sqrt{n(x\vee 1)} + C_2 x^2\right] \leq 8e^{-x} \ , \tag{100}$$

where C_1, C_2, C_3 are positive universal constants.

The proof is postponed to Section 7.10.

Fix some $x > 0$. For any integer j, set $\epsilon_j = 2^{-j+1}$, and let N_j denote a minimal ε_j-covering number of $\mathcal{V}$. Note that $N_j \leq \binom{p}{s}(1+2^{j+1})^s$ by (95). Let $\mathcal{V}_j \subset \mathcal{V}$ be an ε_j-net for $\mathcal{V}$ of cardinality N_j. Let $\Pi_j : \mathcal{V} \mapsto \mathcal{V}_j$ be such that $\|\Pi_j v - v\| \leq \varepsilon_j$ for all $v \in \mathcal{V}$. Since $v \mapsto Q_4^\circ(v)$ is almost surely continuous, we have the following decomposition

$$Q_4^\circ(v) = Q_4^\circ(\Pi_0 v) + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left[Q_4^\circ(\Pi_{j+1} v) - Q_4^\circ(\Pi_j v) \right] ,$$

from which we deduce

$$\inf_{v \in \mathcal{V}} |Q_4^\circ(v)| \geq \inf_{v \in \mathcal{V}} |Q_4^\circ(\Pi_0 v)| - \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}} |Q_4^\circ(\Pi_{j+1} v) - Q_4^\circ(\Pi_j v)| ,$$

We simultaneously control the deviations of all these suprema.

Using (99) together with the fact that $N_0 \leq 2$ (the diameter of $\mathcal{V}$ is 2 and only opposite vectors lie at a distance 2),

$$\inf_{v \in \mathcal{V}} |Q_4^\circ(\Pi_0 v)| \geq 3n - C\sqrt{nx}$$

with probability larger than $1 - x^{-1}$.

For any integer $j \geq 0$, the range of $v \mapsto (\Pi_j v, \Pi_{j+1} v)$ is a set with cardinality at most $N_j N_{j+1} \leq N_{j+1}^2$. Moreover, by the triangle inequality, $\|\Pi_j v - \Pi_{j+1} v\| \leq \|\Pi_j v - v\| + \|\Pi_{j+1} v - v\| \leq 3\epsilon_{j+1}$, for any $v \in \mathcal{V}$. Hence, by (127), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{3\epsilon_{j+1}} \sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}} |Q_4^\circ(\Pi_{j+1} v) - Q_4^\circ(\Pi_j v)| \quad &\leq \quad C_1 \left[\sqrt{ns \log\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right)} + \left[s \log\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right) \right]^2 \right] \\
&+ \quad C_2 \left[\sqrt{ns \log\left(1 + \frac{2}{\epsilon_{j+1}}\right)} + \left(s \log\left(1 + \frac{2}{\epsilon_{j+1}}\right) \right)^2 \right] \\
&+ \quad C_3 \left[\sqrt{nx} + x^2 \right] + C_4 \left[\sqrt{nj} + j^2 \right]
\end{aligned}$$

with propability larger than $1 - 8e^{-j}e^{-x}$. Gathering all these deviation inequalities leads to

$$\inf_{v \in \mathcal{V}} |Q_4^\circ(v)| \geq n - \sqrt{6nx} - C_1 \left[\sqrt{ns \log\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right)} + \left[s \log\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right) \right]^2 \right] - C_2 \left[\sqrt{nx} + x^2 \right] , \tag{101}$$

with probability larger than $1 - Ce^{-x} - x^{-1}$.

Gathering the decomposition (97) with the deviation bounds (101), (128), (96) with the choice $x = s\log(ep/s)$, and (98), we arrive at the following: with probability tending to one under the null,

$$V \geq \frac{3 - C\sqrt{\zeta} - Cn\zeta^2}{1 + 9\sqrt{\zeta}} . \tag{102}$$

7.3.2 Under H_1

Under the alternative, let $v = \mathbf{\Sigma}^{1/2}\Delta\mu / \|\mathbf{\Sigma}^{1/2}\Delta\mu\|$ and $t = \|\Delta\mu\|^2 / \|\mathbf{\Sigma}^{1/2}\Delta\mu\|$. We have

$$V \leq \frac{n \sum_i \left| v^\top (X_{\ddagger i} - \bar{X}_\ddagger) \right|^4}{\left(\sum_i \left[v^\top (X_{\ddagger i} - \bar{X}_\ddagger) \right]^2 \right)^2}$$

Note that

$$v^\top (X_{\ddagger i} - \mathbb{E}\, X_\ddagger) = w_i t + z_i, \quad w_i := \nu - \eta_i, \quad z_i = v^\top Z_i \ .$$

For any integer k, define $S_k := \sum_i (w_i t + z_i)^k$. Then,

$$V \le n \frac{S_4 - 4S_3 S_1/n + 6S_2 S_1^2/n^2 - 3S_1^4/n^3}{\left(S_2 - S_1^2/n\right)^2} \ .$$

By Chebyshev inequality, $S_1 = \sqrt{n} O_P\,(1+t)$, $S_2 = n + n\nu(1-\nu)t^2 + \sqrt{n} O_P\left(1+t^2\right)$, $S_3 = n\nu(1-\nu)(2\nu-1)t^3 + \sqrt{n} O_P\left[1+t^3\right]$ and $S_4 = n[3 + 6\nu(1-\nu)t^2 + \nu(1-\nu)(\nu^3 + (1-\nu)^3)t^4] + \sqrt{n} O_P\left[1+t^4\right]$.

$$\begin{aligned} V &\le \frac{3 + 6\nu(1-\nu)t^2 + \nu(1-\nu)(\nu^3 + (1-\nu)^3)t^4 + n^{-1/2} O_P(1+t^4)}{1 + 2\nu(1-\nu)t^2 + \nu^2(1-\nu)^2 t^4 + n^{-1/2} O_P(1+t^4)} \\ &= 3 + \frac{\nu(1-\nu)[1 - 6\nu(1-\nu)]t^4 + n^{-1/2} O_P(1+t^4)}{1 + 2\nu(1-\nu)t^2 + \nu^2(1-\nu)^2 t^4 + n^{-1/2} O_P(1+t^4)} \ , \end{aligned}$$

where $(1 - 6\nu(1-\nu))$ is negative for $|\nu - 1/2| < \sqrt{3}/6$. So for the test based on V to be powerful, it suffices that $t^4 \gg (\zeta^{1/2} \vee n\zeta^2)$.

7.4 Proof of Proposition 6

Define

$$V = \max_{\|u\|_0 \le s} \frac{\sum_i \left|u^\top (X_i - \bar{X})\right|}{\left(n \sum_i \left[u^\top (X_i - \bar{X})\right]^2\right)^{1/2}} \ .$$

The proof is similar to that of Proposition 5, but the numerator is controlled via Chernoff's bound, which is applicable since it has finite moment generating function. We work with the standardized data (78), and without loss of generality, we assume that $\mathbb{E}(X) = 0$ always. By a simple change of variables, one may write V as

$$V = \max_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \frac{Q_1(v)}{\sqrt{n}\, Q_2(v)^{1/2}} \ ,$$

where Q_2 is defined in (93), $\mathcal{V}$ in (94), and

$$Q_1(v) := \sum_i \left|v^\top (X_{\ddagger i} - \bar{X}_\ddagger)\right| \ .$$

7.4.1 Under H_0

First, assume the null hypothesis is true. We upper bound V by

$$V \le \frac{\max_{v \in \mathcal{V}} Q_1(v)}{\sqrt{n} \min_{v \in \mathcal{V}} Q_2(v)^{1/2}} \ . \tag{103}$$

Note that $X_{\ddagger i} = Z_i$ under the null.

We first bound the denominator from below using the same approach as in Proposition 5.

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\min_{v \in \mathcal{V}} Q_2(v) \le n - 5n\sqrt{\zeta} - 2\sqrt{2nx}\right] \le e^{-x} \ , \tag{104}$$

for any $x > 0$.

We now bound the numerator from above, still under the null. We have

$$Q_1(v) \leq Q_1^\circ(v) + n|v^\top \bar{Z}|, \quad Q_1^\circ(v) := \sum_{i=1}^n |v^\top Z_i| \ . \tag{105}$$

We have that $n \max_{v\in\mathcal{V}} |v^\top \bar{Z}|^2$ is distributed as the maximum of $\binom{p}{s}$ (possibly dependent) χ^2_s-distributed random variables. Applying the union bound and then Lemma 6, as above we derive

$$\mathbb{P}\left[n \max_{v\in\mathcal{V}} |v^\top \bar{Z}|^2 \geq s + 2\sqrt{sx} + 2x\right] \leq e^{s\log(ep/s)-x} \ ,$$

for all $x > 0$, and choosing $x = 2s\log(ep/s)$, we get

$$\mathbb{P}\left[n \max_{v\in\mathcal{V}} |v^\top \bar{Z}| \geq 3n\sqrt{\zeta}\right] = o(1) \ . \tag{106}$$

The function $g : \mathbb{R}^{np} \to \mathbb{R}$, $g(z_1, \ldots, z_n) = \max_{v\in\mathcal{V}} \sum_i |v^\top z_i|$, is $\sqrt{n}$-Lipschitz with respect to the Euclidean norm, since

$$\begin{aligned} g(z_1, \ldots, z_n) - g(z'_1, \ldots, z'_n) &\leq \max_{v\in\mathcal{V}} \sum_i \left(|v^\top z_i| - |v^\top z'_i|\right) \leq \max_{v\in\mathcal{V}} \sum_i |v^\top (z_i - z'_i)| \\ &\leq \sum_i \|z_i - z'_i\| \leq \sqrt{n}\sqrt{\sum_i \|z_i - z'_i\|^2} \ , \end{aligned}$$

where we used, in order, the triangle inequality, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality with the fact that $v \in \mathcal{V}$ is normed, and again the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Therefore, by the Gaussian isoperimetric inequality (Ledoux, 1996, Prop. 2.1),

$$\mathbb{P}_0\left[\max_{v\in\mathcal{V}} Q_1^\circ(v) \geq \mathbb{E}_0\left[\max_{v\in\mathcal{V}} Q_1^\circ(v)\right] + \sqrt{2nx}\right] \leq e^{-x} \ , \tag{107}$$

for any $x > 0$. We now upper bound $\mathbb{E}_0[\max_{v\in\mathcal{V}} Q_1^\circ(v)]$ using a chaining argument.

Lemma 10. *The process $(Q_1^\circ(v), v \in \mathcal{V})$ is subgaussian with respect to the metric $\rho(v, w) := 2\sqrt{n}\|v - w\|$ in the following sense*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[|Q_1^\circ(v) - Q_1^\circ(w)| > x\right] \leq 2\exp\left[-\tfrac{x^2}{8n\|v-w\|^2}\right] \ , \quad \forall v, w \in \mathcal{V}, \ x > 0 \ .$$

The proof is postponed to Section 7.10.

Below, C denotes a positive universal constant that may change with each appearance. Since the process is subgaussian, we can use the following maximal inequality (van der Vaart and Wellner, 1996, Cor. 2.2.8)

$$\mathbb{E}_0\left[\max_{v\in\mathcal{V}} Q_1^\circ(v)\right] \leq \mathbb{E}_0[Q_1^\circ(v)] + C\int_0^\infty \sqrt{\log D(\epsilon, \rho)}\mathrm{d}\epsilon \ , \tag{108}$$

where $D(\epsilon, \rho)$ is the ϵ-packing number of $\mathcal{V}$ with respect to the semi-metric ρ. The diameter of $\mathcal{V}$ with respect to ρ is equal to $4\sqrt{n}$. Thus, we are only interested in ϵ smaller than $4\sqrt{n}$. Furthermore, by comparing the packing number with the covering number $N(\epsilon, \rho)$, we obtain

$$D(\epsilon, \rho) \leq N(\epsilon/2, \rho) = N(\epsilon/(4\sqrt{n}), \|.\|) \leq \binom{p}{s}(1 + 8\sqrt{n}/\epsilon)^s \ ,$$

by (95). Hence, the second term on the right-hand side of (108) is bounded by

$$4C\sqrt{n}\sqrt{s\log\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right)} + C\sqrt{s}\int_0^{4\sqrt{n}}\sqrt{\log\left[1+\frac{8\sqrt{n}}{\epsilon}\right]}\mathrm{d}\epsilon \le Cn\sqrt{\zeta}\ .$$

Therefore, coming back to (108) and adding in the fact that $\mathbb{E}_0[Q_1^\circ(v)] = n\sqrt{2/\pi}$, we get

$$\mathbb{E}_0\left[\max_{v\in\mathcal{V}} Q_1^\circ(v)\right] \le n\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} + Cn\sqrt{\zeta}\ . \tag{109}$$

Then choosing $x = s\log(ep/s)$ in (107) and combining that with (108), (105) and (106), we come to

$$\mathbb{P}_0\left[\max_{v\in\mathcal{V}} Q_1(v) \ge n\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} + Cn\sqrt{\zeta}\right] = o(1)\ . \tag{110}$$

Gathering the three deviation bounds (103), (104) with $x = s\log(ep/s)$, and (110), we arrived at the following: with probability tending to one under the null,

$$V \le \frac{\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} + C\sqrt{\zeta}}{\left[1 - C\sqrt{\zeta}\right]^{1/2}} \le \sqrt{\tfrac{2}{\pi}} + C\sqrt{\zeta}\ . \tag{111}$$

7.4.2 Under H_1

Under the alternative, let $v = \mathbf{\Sigma}^{1/2}\Delta\mu/\|\mathbf{\Sigma}^{1/2}\Delta\mu\|$ and $t = \|\Delta\mu\|^2/\|\mathbf{\Sigma}^{1/2}\Delta\mu\|$. We have

$$V \ge \frac{\sum_i \left|v^\top(X_{\ddagger i} - \bar{X}_\ddagger)\right|}{\left(n\sum_i\left[v^\top(X_{\ddagger i} - \bar{X}_\ddagger)\right]^2\right)^{1/2}} \ge \frac{\sum_i \left|v^\top(X_{\ddagger i} - \mathbb{E}\,X_\ddagger)\right| - n\left|v^\top(\bar{X}_\ddagger - \mathbb{E}\,X_\ddagger)\right|}{\left(n\sum_i\left[v^\top(X_{\ddagger i} - \mathbb{E}\,X_\ddagger)\right]^2\right)^{1/2}}\ . \tag{112}$$

Note that

$$v^\top(X_{\ddagger i} - \mathbb{E}\,X_\ddagger) = w_i t + z_i, \quad w_i := \nu - \eta_i, \quad z_i := v^\top Z_i\ .$$

Simple moment calculations and an application of Chebyshev's inequality leads to

$$\sum_i\left[v^\top(X_{\ddagger i} - \mathbb{E}\,X_\ddagger)\right]^2 = n + n\nu(1-\nu)t^2 + O_P(\sqrt{n} + \sqrt{n}t^2)\ , \tag{113}$$

and

$$n\left|v^\top(\bar{X}_\ddagger - \mathbb{E}\,X_\ddagger)\right| = O_P(\sqrt{n} + \sqrt{n}t)\ . \tag{114}$$

Chebyshev's inequality also implies

$$\sum_i\left|v^\top(X_{\ddagger i} - \mathbb{E}\,X_\ddagger)\right| = n\Psi_1(t) + O_P(\sqrt{n\Psi_2(t)})\ , \tag{115}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_1(t) := \mathbb{E}[|w_i t + z_i|] &= 2\nu(1-\nu)t\left[\Phi((1-\nu)t) - \Phi(-\nu t)\right] \\ &\quad + 2(1-\nu)\phi(\nu t) + 2\nu\phi((1-\nu)t)\ , \\ \Psi_2(t) := \mathrm{Var}[|w_i t + z_i|] &= \nu(1-\nu)t^2 + 1 - \Psi_1(t)^2\ ,\end{aligned} \tag{116}$$

where ϕ and Φ denote the standard normal density and distribution function, respectively. In order to prove that the test is powerful, we use an extraction argument: we only need to prove that for any subsequence of (n, p, μ) there exists a subsequence such that the test is powerful. This allows us to assume that $t \to a \in [0, \infty]$.

- If $t \to \infty$, $\Psi_1(t) \sim 2\nu(1-\nu)t$ while $\Psi_2(t) = \nu(1-\nu)[1-4\nu(1-\nu)]t^2 + 1 + o(1)$, so that (115) is equal to $2\nu(1-\nu)nt + O_P(\sqrt{n}t)$. With (113) and (114), this implies that $V \to 2\sqrt{\nu(1-\nu)}$. This quantity is larger than $\sqrt{2/\pi}$ as soon as $|\nu - \frac{1}{2}| < \sqrt{(\pi-2)/(4\pi)}$.

- If $t = o(1)$, a Taylor development gives

$$\Psi_1(t) = \sqrt{\tfrac{2}{\pi}}\left[1 + \tfrac{t^2}{2}\nu(1-\nu) - \tfrac{t^4}{24}\nu(1-\nu)(1-3\nu+3\nu^2)\right] + O(t^6), \tag{117}$$

  while $\Psi_2(t) = O(1)$, so that, with (113) and (114), we have

$$\begin{aligned} V &\geq \frac{\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}\left[1 + \frac{t^2}{2}\nu(1-\nu) - \frac{t^4}{24}\nu(1-\nu)(1-3\nu+3\nu^2)\right] + O(t^6) + O_P(1/\sqrt{n})}{\left(1 + \nu(1-\nu)t^2 + O_P(1/\sqrt{n})\right)^{1/2}} \\ &= \sqrt{\tfrac{2}{\pi}}\left[1 + \tfrac{t^4}{24}\nu(1-\nu)(6\nu - 6\nu^2 - 1)\right] + O(t^6) + O_P(1/\sqrt{n}), \end{aligned}$$

  so that the test is powerful when $t^4 \gg \zeta^{1/2}$ and $|\nu - \frac{1}{2}| < \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}$ so that $6\nu - 6\nu^2 - 1 > 0$.

- If $t \to a \in (0,\infty)$, the right-hand side in (112) converges to $f(a) := \Psi_1(a)/\sqrt{1+\nu(1-\nu)a^2}$. Thus, we only need to show that $f(a) > \sqrt{2/\pi}$ for any $a \in (0,\infty)$. Since $f(0) = \sqrt{2/\pi}$, it suffices to show that $f'(a) > 0$ for $a > 0$. This amounts to studying the sign of the following expression:

$$A := \Psi_1'(a)(1 + \nu(1-\nu)a^2) - \Psi_1(a)\nu(1-\nu)a \ .$$

  After elementary calculations, we obtain

$$A = 2\nu(1-\nu)\left[\int_0^{\nu a} \phi(x)dx + \int_0^{(1-\nu)a} \phi(x)dx - (1-\nu)a\phi(\nu a) - \nu a\phi((1-\nu)a)\right] \ .$$

  Since the function ϕ is decreasing on $\mathbb{R}^+$, it follows $A > 0$ for $\nu = 1/2$. By symmetry, we can assume that $\nu > 1/2$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{A}{2\nu(1-\nu)} &> [(1-\nu)a\phi((1-\nu)a) + (\nu a - (1-\nu)a)\phi(\nu a)] + (1-\nu)a\phi((1-\nu)a) \\ &\quad - (1-\nu)a\phi(\nu a) - \nu a\phi((1-\nu)a) \\ &= (3\nu - 2)a\left[\phi(\nu a) - \phi((1-\nu)a)\right] \ , \end{aligned}$$

  which is positive for $3\nu - 2 \leq 0$. In conclusion, the test is powerful as long as $|\nu - \frac{1}{2}| < \frac{1}{6}$.

7.5 Proof of Proposition 7

The arguments are analogous to those in Section 7.2.3, but more technical in the details. We continue with the notation introduced in Section 7.4 and introduce some more. Define

$$\mathcal{U}_\delta = \left\{u \in \mathbb{R}^p : \|u\| = 1, \|u\|_0 \leq s \text{ and } |u^\top \Delta\mu| \leq (1-\delta)\|\Delta\mu\|\right\} \ .$$

(Note that this differs from the definition in Section 7.2.3.) As in Section 7.2.3, it suffices to show that, for any fixed $\delta \in (0,1)$, with probability tending to one, $\mathcal{U}_\delta$ does not contain any $\hat{u}$ defined as in (31). We shall provide uniform controls of the first absolute and the second centered (sample) moments in a direction $u \in \mathcal{U}_\delta$, namely, $\sum_i \left|u^\top(X_i - \bar{X})\right|$ and $\sum_i \left[u^\top(X_i - \bar{X})\right]^2$. Recall that C denotes a positive constant that may change with each appearance.

STEP 1: Control of the first absolute moment. Denote $t_\star = \|\Delta\mu\|^2/\|\mathbf{\Sigma}^{1/2}\Delta\mu\|$. For any $u \in \mathbb{R}^p$, let $t_u = u^\top\Delta\mu/\|\mathbf{\Sigma}^{1/2}u\|$ and $v_u = \mathbf{\Sigma}^{1/2}u/\|\mathbf{\Sigma}^{1/2}u\|$. Observe that $v_u \in \mathcal{V}$ with $\mathcal{V}$ defined in (94). Uniformly, over $u \in \mathcal{U}_\delta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\sum_i \left|u^\top(X_i - \bar{X})\right|}{\|\mathbf{\Sigma}^{1/2}u\|} &\leq \sum_i \left|(\eta_i - \nu)t_u + v_u^\top Z_i\right| + n|\bar{\eta} - \nu||t_u| + n|v_u^\top \bar{Z}| \\ &\leq Q_1^\ddagger(v_u) + n|\bar{\eta} - \nu| \sup_{u\in\mathcal{U}_\delta} |t_u| + n \sup_{v\in\mathcal{V}} |v^\top \bar{Z}| \ , \end{aligned} \tag{118}$$

where $Q_1^\ddagger(v_u) := \sum_i \left|(\eta_i - \nu)t_u + v_u^\top Z_i\right|$. First, $\sup_{v\in\mathcal{V}} |v^\top\bar{Z}|^2$ is distributed as the supremum of $\binom{s}{p}$ (possibly dependent) χ^2_s random variables. Using an union bound together with Lemma 6 leads to $\sup_{v\in\mathcal{V}} n|v^\top\bar{Z}| \leq 4n\sqrt{\zeta}$ with probability going to one. By Chebychev inequality,

$$\bar{\eta} - \nu = O_P(n^{-1/2}) \ . \tag{119}$$

Since the the $(2s)$-sparse Riesz constant of $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is bounded,

$$\sup_{u\in\mathcal{U}_\delta} |t_u| = O(t_\star) = o(1) \ . \tag{120}$$

Hence, $n|\bar{\eta} - \nu| \sup_{u\in\mathcal{U}_\delta} |t_u| = o_P(\sqrt{n})$, with $\sqrt{n} \leq n\sqrt{\zeta}$ eventually, since $n\zeta = s\log(ep/s) \to \infty$ by assumption.

Let us turn to $Q_1^\ddagger(v_u)$. Let $\eta = (\eta_i)_{i=1}^n$ and let $\mathbb{P}_\eta$ denote the probability given η. As before, we use the Gaussian isoperimetric inequality (Ledoux, 1996, Prop. 2.1) to prove that, for any $x > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}_\eta\left[\sup_{u\in\mathcal{U}_\delta} R_{u,\eta} \geq \mathbb{E}_\eta\left(\sup_{u\in\mathcal{U}_\delta} R_{u,\eta}\right) + \sqrt{2nx}\right] \leq e^{-x} \ ,$$

where

$$R_{u,\eta} := Q_1^\ddagger(v_u) - \mathbb{E}_\eta[Q_1^\ddagger(v_u)] \ .$$

The deviations of the differences also follow a subgaussian distribution as proved in Section 7.10.

Lemma 11. *The process $(R_{u,\eta}, u \in \mathcal{U}_\delta)$ is subgaussian in the sense that there is a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[|R_{u_1,\eta} - R_{u_2,\eta}| > x\right] \leq 2\exp\left[-C\tfrac{x^2}{n\|u_1 - u_2\|^2}\right] \ , \quad \forall v, w \in \mathcal{V},\ x > 0 \ .$$

Thus, we can apply a maximal inequality (van der Vaart and Wellner, 1996, Cor. 2.2.8) based on the metric entropy of $\mathcal{U}_\delta$ with respect to the Euclidean metric, and obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_\eta\left[\sup_{u\in\mathcal{U}_\delta} R_{u,\eta}\right] \leq Cn\sqrt{\zeta} \ .$$

Furthermore, uniformly in $u \in \mathcal{U}_\delta$,

$$\left|\mathbb{E}_\eta[Q_1^\ddagger(v_u)] - \mathbb{E}[Q_1^\ddagger(v_u)]\right| \leq Cn|\nu - \bar{\eta}|(1 \vee |t_u|) = O(n|\nu - \bar{\eta}|(1 \vee |t_\star|) = o_P(n\sqrt{\zeta}) \ ,$$

as we saw earlier. Noting that $\mathbb{E}[Q_1^\ddagger(v_u)] = n\Psi_1(t_u)$ (with Ψ_1 defined in (116)), we get

$$\sup_{u\in\mathcal{U}_\delta} \left|Q_1^\ddagger(v_u) - n\Psi_1(t_u)\right| \leq Cn\sqrt{\zeta} \ ,$$

with probability tending to one, which combined with (118) and using the bounds we obtained for the last two terms there, implies

$$\frac{\sum_i \left|u^\top(X_i-\bar X)\right|}{\|\mathbf{\Sigma}^{1/2}u\|} \le n\Psi_1(t_u) + Cn\sqrt{\zeta}\ , \qquad \forall u\in\mathcal{U}_\delta\ . \tag{121}$$

STEP 2: Control of the second moment. Uniformly, over $u\in\mathcal{U}_\delta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\sum_i \left[u^\top(X_i-\bar X)\right]^2}{\|\mathbf{\Sigma}^{1/2}u\|^2} &= n\bar\eta(1-\bar\eta)t_u^2 + Q_2(v_u) + 2t_u\sum_i\left[v_u^\top(Z_i-\bar Z)\right](\eta_i-\bar\eta)\\ &\ge n\bar\eta(1-\bar\eta)t_u^2 + \inf_{v\in\mathcal{V}} Q_2(v) - 2t_u\sup_{v\in\mathcal{V}}\left|v^\top\sum_i Z_i(\eta_i-\bar\eta)\right|\ .\end{aligned}$$

As explained in a previous proof (Section 7.4), there is a constant $C>0$ such that $\inf_{v\in\mathcal{V}}Q_2(v)\ge n-Cn\sqrt{\zeta}$ with probability going to one. Also, conditional on η, $\sup_{v\in\mathcal{V}}\left[v^\top\sum_i Z_i(\eta_i-\bar\eta)\right]^2\left[n\bar\eta(1-\bar\eta)\right]^{-1}$ is distributed as the supremum of $\binom{p}{s}$ possibly dependent $\chi^2(s)$ random variables. Hence, there is a constant $C>0$ such that

$$\sup_{v\in\mathcal{V}}\left|v^\top\sum_i Z_i(\eta_i-\bar\eta)\right| \le C\sqrt{\bar\eta(1-\bar\eta)}n\sqrt{\zeta}\ ,$$

with probability going to one. Gathering these bounds with (120) and (119), with probability going to one, we get

$$\frac{\sum_i \left[u^\top(X_i-\bar X)\right]^2}{\|\mathbf{\Sigma}^{1/2}u\|^2} \ge n\eta(1-\eta)t_u^2 + n - Cn\sqrt{\zeta}\ , \qquad \forall u\in\mathcal{U}_\delta\ . \tag{122}$$

Using that fact that $\zeta=o(1)$ and $t_\star=o(1)$, we show similarly that

$$\sup_{u\in\mathcal{U}_\delta}\frac{\sum_i \left[u^\top(X_i-\bar X)\right]^2}{\|\mathbf{\Sigma}^{1/2}u\|^2} \le 1+o_P(1)\ . \tag{123}$$

STEP 3: Control of the statistic (31). Gathering (121), (122) and (123) with (120), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\left[\frac{\sum_i\left|u^\top(X_i-\bar X)\right|}{\left(\sum_i\left[u^\top(X_i-\bar X)\right]^2\right)^{1/2}} - \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}\right]_+\left(\sum_i\left[u^\top(X_i-\bar X)\right]^2\right)^2\\ &\le \left[\frac{\Psi_1(t_u)+C\sqrt{\zeta}}{1+\eta(1-\eta)t_u^2 - C'\sqrt{\zeta}} - \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}\right]_+\|\mathbf{\Sigma}^{1/2}u\|^4(1+o_P(1))\\ &\le \frac{(u^\top\Delta\mu)^4}{24}\nu(1-\nu)(6\nu-6\nu^2-1) + O_P[t_u^2(u^\top\Delta\mu)^4] + C\|\mathbf{\Sigma}^{1/2}u\|^4\sqrt{\zeta}\\ &\le (1-\delta)^4\frac{\|\Delta\mu\|^4}{24}\nu(1-\nu)(6\nu-6\nu^2-1) + o_P(u^\top\Delta\mu)^4 + C\Upsilon_s^2\frac{\|\mathbf{\Sigma}^{1/2}\Delta\mu\|^4}{\|\Delta\mu\|^4}\sqrt{\zeta}\\ &\le (1-\delta)^4\frac{\|\Delta\mu\|^4}{24}\nu(1-\nu)(6\nu-6\nu^2-1)(1+o_P(1))\ ,\end{aligned}$$

where we used the Taylor development (117), and in the last line, we used the fact that Υ_s (the s-sparse Riesz constant of $\mathbf{\Sigma}$) is assumed to be bounded, (120) and $t_\star^4\gg\zeta$.

Conversely, for $u=\hat u=\Delta\mu/\|\Delta\mu\|$, one can show in exactly the same way that the statistic in (31) is larger than $\frac{\|\Delta\mu\|^4}{24}\nu(1-\nu)(6\nu-6\nu^2-1)(1+o_P(1))$. Thus, for any fixed $\delta\in(0,1)$, $\mathbb{P}[\hat u\in\mathcal{U}_\delta]=o(1)$. This concludes the proof.

7.6 Proof of Proposition 10

The proof is similar to that of Proposition 6. We still assume that $\mathbb{E}[X] = 0$ without loss of generality (since the statistic is translation invariant) and work with the standardized observations (78). We also use the same notation, except that we redefine the statistic V to be

$$V = \max_{\|u\|_0 \le s} \frac{\sqrt{n}\sum_i \left[u^\top (X_i - \bar{X})\right]^3}{\left(\sum_i \left[u^\top (X_i - \bar{X})\right]^2\right)^{3/2}} = \sqrt{n} \max_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \frac{Q_3(v)}{Q_2(v)^{3/2}} \ ,$$

where Q_2 is defined in (93), $\mathcal{V}$ in (94), and $Q_3(v) := \sum_i \left[v^\top (X_{\ddagger i} - \bar{X}_\ddagger)\right]^3$

7.6.1 Under H_0

Suppose we are under the null, so that $X_{\ddagger i} = Z_i$. Noting that

$$Q_3(v) = Q_3^\circ(v) - 3Q_2^\circ(v)(v^\top \bar{Z}) + 2n(v^\top \bar{Z})^3 \ ,$$

where $Q_2^\circ(v) := \sum_i (v^\top Z_i)^2$ and $Q_3^\circ(v) := \sum_i (v^\top Z_i)^3$, we upper bound V by

$$\begin{aligned} n^{-1/2} V &\le \frac{\max_{v \in \mathcal{V}} Q_3(v)}{\min_{v \in \mathcal{V}} Q_2(v)^{3/2}} \\ &\le \frac{\max_{v \in \mathcal{V}} Q_3^\circ(v) + 3\max_{v \in \mathcal{V}} Q_2^\circ(v)|v^\top \bar{Z}| + 2n \max_{v \in \mathcal{V}} |v^\top \bar{Z}|^3}{\min_{v \in \mathcal{V}} Q_2(v)^{3/2}} \ . \end{aligned} \tag{124}$$

The denominator has already been considered in the previous proof (104), so that we concentrate on the numerator. We rely on a chaining argument combined with the following deviation inequalities.

Lemma 12. *For any $x > 0$, and any unit vectors v, w, any $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\left|\sum_{i=1}^n a_i (v^\top Z_i)^3\right| \ge C_1 \|a\|(\sqrt{x} + 1) + C_2 \|a\|_\infty \sqrt{\log(n)} x + C_3 \|a\|_\infty x^{3/2}\right] \le 2e^{-x} \ , \tag{125}$$

$$\mathbb{P}\left[|Q_3^\circ(v)| \ge C_1 \sqrt{n}(\sqrt{x} + 1) + C_2 x^{3/2}\right] \le 2e^{-x} \ , \tag{126}$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}\left[|Q_3^\circ(v) - Q_3^\circ(w)| \ge \|v - w\|\left(C_1 \sqrt{n}(\sqrt{x} + 1) + C_2 x^{3/2}\right)\right] \le 6e^{-x} \ , \tag{127}$$

where C_1, C_2, C_3 are positive universal constants.

The proof is postponed to Section 7.10.

Fix some $x > 0$. For any integer j, set $\epsilon_j = 2^{-j}$, and let N_j denote the ε_j-covering number of $\mathcal{V}$. Note that $N_j \le \binom{p}{s}(1 + 2^{j+1})^s$ by (95). Let $\mathcal{V}_j \subset \mathcal{V}$ be an ε_j-net for $\mathcal{V}$ of cardinality N_j. Let $\Pi_j : \mathcal{V} \mapsto \mathcal{V}_j$ be such that $\|\Pi_j v - v\| \le \varepsilon_j$ for all $v \in \mathcal{V}$. Since $v \mapsto Q_3^\circ(v)$ is almost surely continuous, we have the following decomposition:

$$Q_3^\circ(v) = Q_3^\circ(\Pi_0 v) + \sum_{j=1}^\infty \left[Q_3^\circ(\Pi_{j+1} v) - Q_3^\circ(\Pi_j v)\right] \ ,$$

from which we deduce

$$\sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}} |Q_3^\circ(v)| \le \sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}} |Q_3^\circ(\Pi_0 v)| + \sum_{j=1}^\infty \sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}} |Q_3^\circ(\Pi_{j+1} v) - Q_3^\circ(\Pi_j v)| \ ,$$

We simultaneously control the deviations of all these suprema.

Combining (125) together with an union bound and the fact that $\log N_0 \leq s\log(3ep/s)$, we obtain

$$\sup_{v\in\mathcal{V}} |Q_3^\circ(\Pi_0 v)| \leq C\left[1+\sqrt{ns\log\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right)}+\left[s\log\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right)\right]^{3/2}+\sqrt{nx}+x^{3/2}\right]$$

with probability larger than $1-e^{-x}$.

For any integer $j\geq 0$, the range of $v\mapsto(\Pi_j v,\Pi_{j+1}v)$ is a set with cardinality at most $N_jN_{j+1}\leq N_{j+1}^2$. Moreover, by the triangle inequality, $\|\Pi_j v-\Pi_{j+1}v\|\leq\|\Pi_j v-v\|+\|\Pi_{j+1}v-v\|\leq 3\epsilon_{j+1}$, for any $v\in\mathcal{V}$. Hence, by (127), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{3\epsilon_{j+1}}\sup_{v\in\mathcal{V}}|Q_3^\circ(\Pi_{j+1}v)-Q_3^\circ(\Pi_j v)| &\leq C\left[\sqrt{ns\log\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right)}+\left[s\log\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right)\right]^{3/2}\right]\\ &+ C\left[\sqrt{ns\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon_{j+1}}\right)}+\left(s\log\left(1+\frac{2}{\epsilon_{j+1}}\right)\right)^{3/2}\right]\\ &+ C\left[\sqrt{nx}+x^{3/2}+\sqrt{nj}+j^{3/2}\right]\end{aligned}$$

with probability larger than $1-6e^{-j}e^{-x}$. Gathering all these deviation inequalities leads to

$$\sup_{v\in\mathcal{V}}|Q_3^\circ(v)|\leq C\left[\sqrt{ns\log\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right)}+\left[s\log\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right)\right]^{3/2}+\sqrt{nx}+x^{3/2}\right], \tag{128}$$

with probability larger than $1-Ce^{-x}$. In fact, $\sup_{v\in\mathcal{V}}|Q_3^\circ(v)|$ is the leading term in (124) since, for any $x>0$, $\mathbb{P}_0\left[\max_{v\in\mathcal{V}}|v^\top\bar{Z}|>C_1\sqrt{s\log(ep/s)/n}+\sqrt{2x/n}\right]\leq e^{-x}$ and

$$\mathbb{P}_0\left[\max_{v\in\mathcal{V}}Q_2^\circ(v)\geq n\left(1+\sqrt{s/n}+\sqrt{2s\log(ep/s)/n}+\sqrt{2x/n}\right)^2\right]\leq e^{-x}$$

by Lemma 7.

In conclusion, under the null hypothesis, for any $0<x<n$

$$V\leq\frac{C_1\left[\sqrt{\frac{s\log\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right)}{n}}+\frac{\left[s\log\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right)\right]^{3/2}}{n}\right]+C_2\left[\frac{\sqrt{x}}{n}+\frac{x^{3/2}}{n}\right]}{\left[1-\frac{1}{n}-5\sqrt{\frac{s\log\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right)}{n}}-2\sqrt{\frac{2x}{n}}\right]_+^{3/2}} \tag{129}$$

with probability larger than $1-Ce^{-x}$.

7.6.2 Under H_1

Under the alternative, let $v=\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2}\Delta\mu/\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2}\Delta\mu\|$, as before. Then $v^\top X_{\ddagger i}=\omega_i t+z_i$, where $t:=\|\Delta\mu\|^2/\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2}\Delta\mu\|$, $\omega_i:=\nu-\eta_i$ and $z_i:=v^\top Z_i, i=1,\dots,n$ are iid standard normal. For any integer k, define $S_k:=\sum_i(\omega_i t+z_i)^k$. Then, $Q_2(v)=S_2-S_1^2/n$ and $Q_3(v)=S_3+3S_2S_1/n+2S_1^3/n^2$. By Chebyshev inequality, we have $Q_2(v)=n(1+\nu(1-\nu)t^2)(1+O_P(1/\sqrt{n}))$. Similarly, $Q_3(v)=n\nu(1-\nu)(1-2\nu)t^3+O_P(\sqrt{n}(1\vee t^3))$. If $t=o(1)$, then $V\sim\nu(1-\nu)(1-2\nu)t^3$ in probability. Comparing t^3 with (129) and using Condition (37) on t, we conclude that the test is asymptotically powerful. When $t\to r\in(0,\infty]$, then V converges in probability towards a positive constant and the test is asymptotically powerful. As usual, we handle the case where t does not converge by extracting subsequences.

7.7 Proof of Proposition 11

The proof is then similar to that of Proposition 6. We still assume that $\mathbb{E}[X] = 0$ without loss of generality (since the statistic is translation invariant) and work with the standardized observations (78). We also use the same notation, except that we redefine the statistic V to be

$$\begin{aligned} V &= \max_{\|u\|_0 \le s} \frac{\sum_i \left[u^\top (X_i - \bar{X})\right]^2 \operatorname{sign}[u^\top (X_i - \bar{X})]}{\sum_i \left[u^\top (X_i - \bar{X})\right]^2} \\ &= \max_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \frac{Q_2^{\text{sign}}(v)}{Q_2(v)} , \end{aligned}$$

where Q_2 was defined in (93), $\mathcal{V}$ in (94), and $Q_2^{\text{sign}}(v) := \sum_i [v^\top (X_{\ddagger i} - \bar{X}_\ddagger)]^2 \operatorname{sign}[v^\top (X_{\ddagger i} - \bar{X}_\ddagger)]$.

7.7.1 Under H_0

Under the null, we have $X_{\ddagger i} = Z_i$, and bound V from above by

$$V \le \frac{\max_{v \in \mathcal{V}} Q_2^{\text{sign}}(v)}{\min_{v \in \mathcal{V}} Q_2(v)} .$$

We already controlled the denominator in (104). In particular, $\min_{v \in \mathcal{V}} Q_2(v) \ge n/2$ with probability tending to 1. We proceed with bounding the numerator. First, define

$$Q_2^{\text{sign},\circ}(v) := \sum_i (v^\top Z_i)^2 \operatorname{sign}(v^\top Z_i)$$

and observe that

$$\begin{aligned} |Q_2^{\text{sign},\circ}(v) - Q_2^{\text{sign}}(v)| &\le \sum_i (v^\top Z_i)^2 \left| \operatorname{sign}(v^\top Z_i) - \operatorname{sign}(v^\top (Z_i - \bar{Z})) \right| \\ &\quad + \sum_i \left| (v^\top Z_i)^2 - (v^\top (Z_i - \bar{Z}))^2 \right| \\ &\le 2n (v^\top \bar{Z})^2 + |v^\top \bar{Z}| \sum_i \left| 2 v^\top Z_i - v^\top \bar{Z} \right| \\ &\le 5n (v^\top \bar{Z})^2 + 2 |v^\top \bar{Z}| \sum_i |v^\top Z_i| , \end{aligned}$$

where in the second line we used the fact that $\operatorname{sign}(a) - \operatorname{sign}(a+b) = 0$ when $|a| > |b|$. Thus, the following decomposition holds

$$\max_{v \in \mathcal{V}} Q_2^{\text{sign}}(v) \le \max_{v \in \mathcal{V}} Q_2^{\text{sign},\circ}(v) + 5n \max_{v \in \mathcal{V}} (v^\top \bar{Z})^2 + 2 \Big(\max_{v \in \mathcal{V}} |v^\top \bar{Z}| \Big) \Big(\max_{v \in \mathcal{V}} Q_1^\circ(v) \Big) . \tag{130}$$

By (98), $n \max_{v \in \mathcal{V}} (v^\top \bar{Z})^2 \le 9 s \log(ep/s)$ with probability going to one. Furthermore, by (108) and (109), $\max_{v \in \mathcal{V}} Q_1^\circ(v) \le n$ with probability going to one. It remains to control $\max_{v \in \mathcal{V}} Q_2^{\text{sign},\circ}(v)$. We have the following deviation inequalities.

Lemma 13. *For any $t > 0$ and for any normed vectors v, w such that $v^\top w \ge 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[Q_2^{\text{sign},\circ}(v) \ge \sqrt{8nt} + 2t \right] \le e^{-t} , \tag{131}$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}\left[Q_2^{\text{sign},\circ}(v) - Q_2^{\text{sign},\circ}(w) \ge 4\|v - w\| \sqrt{nt} + 2\|v - w\| t \right] \le e^{-t} . \tag{132}$$

The proof is postponed to Section 7.10.

In order to control $\max_{v\in\mathcal{V}} Q_2^{\mathrm{sign},\circ}(v)$, we combine the same chaining argument developped in the proof of Proposition 10 with the deviation inequalities of Lemma 13. This leads to

$$\max_{v\in\mathcal{V}} Q_2^{\mathrm{sign},\circ}(v) \le C_1\sqrt{ns\log\Big(\frac{ep}{s}\Big)} + C_2 s\log\Big(\frac{ep}{s}\Big) + C_3(\sqrt{nx}+x)\ ,$$

with probability at least $1-e^{-x}$, valid for any $x>0$.

Gathering all these bounds and using $\log(ep/s)=o(n)$, we conclude that

$$V \le C\sqrt{\zeta}, \tag{133}$$

with probability going to one under the null.

7.7.2 Under H_1

Under the alternative, assume without loss of generality that $\nu<1/2$. With $v=\mathbf{\Sigma}^{1/2}\Delta\mu/\|\mathbf{\Sigma}^{1/2}\Delta\mu\|$, as before, we have $v^\top X_{\ddagger i}=\xi_i t+z_i$, where $t=\|\Delta\mu\|^2/\|\mathbf{\Sigma}^{1/2}\Delta\mu\|$, $\xi_i=\nu-\eta_i$, and $z_i\sim\mathcal{N}(0,1)$. We have $Q_2(v)=n+n\nu(1-\nu)t^2+O_P(\sqrt{n+nt^2})$. And then, proceeding as we did earlier,

$$Q_2^{\mathrm{sign}}(v) \ge Q_2^{\mathrm{sign},\circ}(v) - 5n\big(v^\top\bar{X}_\ddagger\big)^2 - 2|v^\top\bar{X}_\ddagger|\sum_i |v^\top X_{\ddagger i}|\ .$$

Using Chebyshev's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |v^\top\bar{X}_\ddagger| &\le |\bar{\xi}|t+|\bar{Z}| = O_P\left(\sqrt{\frac{\nu(1-\nu)}{n}}t+\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)\\ \sum_i |v^\top X_{\ddagger i}| &= n\,O_P\left(1+\nu(1-\nu)t\right)\ . \end{aligned}$$

And with some tedious, but elementary calculations, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}\left[Q_2^{\mathrm{sign},\circ}(v)\right] &= (1-\nu)\big[(\nu^2t^2+1)(1-2\Phi(\nu t))-2\nu t\phi(\nu t)\big]\\ &\quad+\nu\big[((1-\nu)^2t^2+1)(1-2\Phi(-(1-\nu)t))+2(1-\nu)t\phi((1-\nu)t)\big]\\ &=: g(\nu,t)\ , \end{aligned}$$

with $g(\nu,t)$ being strictly increasing in $t>0$. This is because the first derivative with respect to t is equal to

$$4\nu(1-\nu)\big[t\big(\tfrac{1}{2}-\nu\Phi(\nu t)-(1-\nu)\Phi(-(1-\nu)t)\big)+\phi((1-\nu)t)-\phi(\nu t)\big]\ ,$$

and the second to

$$4\nu(1-\nu)\big[\tfrac{1}{2}-\nu\Phi(\nu t)-(1-\nu)\Phi(-(1-\nu)t)\big]\ .$$

The first derivative is equal to 0 at $t=0$ and the second derivative is bounded from below by

$$4\nu(1-\nu)\big[\tfrac{1}{2}-\nu\Phi(\nu t)-(1-\nu)\Phi(-\nu t)\big] = 4\nu(1-\nu)(1-2\nu)\big[-\tfrac{1}{2}+\Phi(\nu t)\big] > 0\ ,$$

when $t>0$. So $\mathbb{E}\left[Q_2^{\mathrm{sign},\circ}(v)\right]$ is indeed increasing in $t>0$. Moreover, a Taylor development at $t=0$ gives

$$\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}\left[Q_2^{\mathrm{sign},\circ}(v)\right] = \frac{1}{3}\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}\nu(1-\nu)(1-2\nu)t^3+O(t^4)\ .$$

To this we add the fact that

$$\frac{1}{n}\operatorname{Var}\left[Q_2^{\mathrm{sign},\circ}(v)\right] \le \frac{1}{n}(1+\nu(1-\nu)t^2)\ .$$

As in the previous proofs, it suffices to prove that the test is asymptotically powerful when t converges to some limit in $\bar{\mathbb{R}}$. (Indeed, if the test is not powerful for some sequence t, then one can extract a subsequence such that t is converging and the risk of the test is bounded away from zero.) First, we focus on the case where $t = o(1)$, which is more subtle. In that case $Q_2(v) \le 2n$ with probability tending to one, and by Chebyshev's inequality,

$$Q_2^{\mathrm{sign}}(v) \ge \frac{n}{3}\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}\nu(1-\nu)(1-2\nu)t^3 + O(nt^4) + O_P(\sqrt{n}).$$

From this we get that

$$V \ge \frac{Q_2^{\mathrm{sign}}(v)}{Q_2(v)} \ge \frac{\frac{n}{3}\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}\nu(1-\nu)(1-2\nu)t^3 + O(nt^4) + O_P(\sqrt{n})}{n(1+o(1))} \sim \frac{1}{3}\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}\nu(1-\nu)(1-2\nu)t^3,$$

when $n^{-1/6} \ll t \ll 1$. With the control of V under the null in (133), and our working assumption (39), we conclude.

Now, if $t \to l \in (0,\infty]$, then by Chebyshev's inequality again,

$$\frac{Q_2^{\mathrm{sign}}(v)}{Q_2(v)} \ge (1-o_P(1))\frac{\mathbb{E}[Q_2^{\mathrm{sign}}(v)]}{\mathbb{E}[Q_2(v)]} \sim \frac{g(\nu,t)}{1+\nu(1-\nu)t^2} \to \begin{cases} \frac{g(\nu,l)}{1+\nu(1-\nu)l^2} & \text{if } l < \infty\ ; \\ 1-2\nu & \text{if } l = \infty\ . \end{cases}$$

In both cases, the limit on the right-hand side is strictly positive.

7.8 Proof of Proposition 12

The proof is similar to that of Proposition 3. We use the same notation. Let V denote the statistic defined in (44). Since $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is diagonal, we have

$$V = \max_{\|v\|_0 \le s} \frac{v^\top \hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_\ddagger v}{v^\top \operatorname{diag}(\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_\ddagger) v}\ , \tag{134}$$

by a simple change of variables $v = \mathbf{\Sigma}^{1/2}u$. We will also use the fact that $\|\mathbf{\Sigma}^{1/2}u\|_0 = \|u\|_0$ for any vector u, since again $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is diagonal.

7.8.1 Under H_0

We first upper-bound V under the null, starting from

$$V \le \frac{\max_{\|v\|_0 \le s} v^\top \hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_\ddagger v}{\min_{\|v\|_0 \le s} v^\top \operatorname{diag}(\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_\ddagger) v} = \frac{\lambda_s^{\max}(\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_\ddagger)}{\min_{j\in[p]} \hat{\sigma}_{jj}/\sigma_{jj}}\ .$$

We already controlled $\lambda_s^{\max}(\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_\ddagger) = \hat{\lambda}_{s,\mathbf{\Sigma}}^{\max}$ in (88), where we found that

$$\lambda_s^{\max}(\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_\ddagger) \le 1 + 15(\sqrt{\zeta} \vee \zeta)\ ,$$

with probability tending to one. Moreover, using the fact that $\hat{\sigma}_{jj}/\sigma_{jj} \sim \frac{1}{n}\chi^2_n$, for any $t > 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}_0\left(\min_{j\in[p]} \frac{\hat{\sigma}_{jj}}{\sigma_{jj}} \leq 1 + 2\sqrt{\frac{t}{n}} + 2\frac{t}{n}\right) \leq pe^{-t} \ ,$$

using Lemma 6 and the union bound, so that

$$\min_{j\in[p]} \frac{\hat{\sigma}_{jj}}{\sigma_{jj}} \geq 1 - 3\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}} - 3\frac{\log p}{n} \ ,$$

with probability tending to one. Since $\log p = o(n)$ and $\frac{1}{n}\log p = O(\zeta)$, we conclude that there is a constant C such that

$$V \leq 1 + C\big(\sqrt{\zeta} \vee \zeta\big). \tag{135}$$

with probability tending to one under the null.

7.8.2 Under H_1

Under the alternative, we choose $v = \Delta\mu_\ddagger/\|\Delta\mu_\ddagger\|$ in (134) as we did in Section 7.2.3.

For the numerator, we saw in (92) that

$$v^\top \hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_\ddagger v \geq 1 + (1 - o_P(1))\nu(1-\nu)\|\Delta\mu_\ddagger\|^2 \ .$$

For the denominator, we obtain

$$v^\top \operatorname{diag}(\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_\ddagger)v = \sum_{j=1}^p \hat{\sigma}_{\ddagger jj} v_j^2 \ ,$$

with

$$\hat{\sigma}_{\ddagger jj} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \big[Z_{ij} - \bar{Z}_j - (\eta_i - \bar{\eta})\Delta\mu_{\ddagger j}\big]^2 \ .$$

Conditional on $\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_n$, we have that $\hat{\sigma}_{\ddagger 11}, \ldots, \hat{\sigma}_{\ddagger pp}$ are independent with $n\hat{\sigma}_{\ddagger jj}$ having the chi-squared distribution with $n-1$ degrees of freedom and non-centrality parameter $B_j := \Delta\mu^2_{\ddagger j}\sum_i(\eta_i - \bar{\eta})^2 = \Delta\mu^2_{\ddagger j} n\bar{\eta}(1-\bar{\eta})$, so that $v^\top \operatorname{diag}(\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_\ddagger)v$ has (conditional) mean

$$\sum_j \frac{1}{n}\big(n - 1 + B_j\big)v_j^2 = 1 - \frac{1}{n} + \bar{\eta}(1-\bar{\eta})\frac{1}{\|\Delta\mu_\ddagger\|^2}\sum_j \Delta\mu^4_{\ddagger j} \ ,$$

and (conditional) variance

$$\sum_j \frac{1}{n^2}\big(2(n-1) + 4B_j\big)v_j^4 = \frac{2(n-1)}{n^2}\frac{1}{\|\Delta\mu_\ddagger\|^4}\sum_j \Delta\mu^4_{\ddagger j} + \frac{1}{\|\Delta\mu_\ddagger\|^4}\frac{4}{n}\bar{\eta}(1-\bar{\eta})\sum_j \Delta\mu^6_{\ddagger j} \ .$$

By Chebyshev's inequality, and the fact that $\bar{\eta} = \nu + O_P(1/\sqrt{n})$, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} v^\top \operatorname{diag}(\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_\ddagger)v \ &\leq \ 1 + \nu(1-\nu)\frac{1}{\|\Delta\mu_\ddagger\|^2}\sum_j \Delta\mu^4_{\ddagger j} \\ &+ \ O_P\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)\frac{1}{\|\Delta\mu_\ddagger\|^2}\left[\sum_j \Delta\mu^4_{\ddagger j} + \sqrt{\sum_j \Delta\mu^4_{\ddagger j}} + \sqrt{\sum_j \Delta\mu^6_{\ddagger j}}\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{136}$$

We have $\sum_j \Delta\mu_{\ddagger j}^k \leq \|\Delta\mu_\ddagger\|^k$ and $\left(\sum_j \Delta\mu_{\ddagger j}^k\right)^{1/k} \leq \|\Delta\mu_\ddagger\|$, for any $k \geq 2$, so that the remainder term in (136) is of order $O_P\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)(1+\|\Delta\mu_\ddagger\|^2)$.

Gathering all of the above, we conclude that

$$\frac{v^\top \hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_\ddagger v}{v^\top \operatorname{diag}(\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_\ddagger) v} \geq 1 + \nu(1-\nu)\frac{\left(\|\Delta\mu_\ddagger\|^2 - \frac{1}{\|\Delta\mu_\ddagger\|^2}\sum_j \Delta\mu_{\ddagger j}^4\right)}{1+\|\Delta\mu_\ddagger\|^2} + o_P\left(\frac{\|\Delta\mu_\ddagger\|^2}{1+\|\Delta\mu_\ddagger\|^2}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right) .$$

Note that when (45) holds, and $p \to \infty$, $(1+\|\Delta\mu_\ddagger\|^2)/\sqrt{n} = o(\|\Delta\mu_\ddagger\|^2)$. We then notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Delta\mu_\ddagger\|^2 - \frac{1}{\|\Delta\mu_\ddagger\|^2}\sum_j \Delta\mu_{\ddagger j}^4 &= \frac{\sum_{j\neq k}\Delta\mu_{\ddagger j}^2\Delta\mu_{\ddagger k}^2}{\sum_j \Delta\mu_{\ddagger j}^2} \\
&= \sum_k \Delta\mu_{\ddagger k}^2(1-\kappa_k^2) \\
&\geq \|\Delta\mu_\ddagger\|^2(1-\kappa^2) ,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\kappa_k = |\Delta\mu_{\ddagger k}|/\|\Delta\mu_\ddagger\|$ and $\kappa = \max_k \kappa_k$ by definition. Hence, when (45) holds, we have

$$\frac{v^\top \hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_\ddagger v}{v^\top \operatorname{diag}(\hat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_\ddagger) v} \geq 1 + \nu(1-\nu)(1-\kappa^2)\frac{\|\Delta\mu_\ddagger\|^2}{1+\|\Delta\mu_\ddagger\|^2} + o_P\left(\frac{\|\Delta\mu_\ddagger\|^2}{1+\|\Delta\mu_\ddagger\|^2}\right) + O_P\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right) ,$$

with κ assumed to be fixed.

Comparing this bound with the control of V under the null in (135), we conclude.

The proof for on the consistency of variable selection is parallel to the one detailed in Section 7.2.3 and details are omitted.

7.9 Proof of Proposition 14

The proof of the detection part is a straightforward adaptation of that of Propositions 6 and 11, and is omitted. We therefore turn to the variable selection part, and focus on proving that $\hat{J}_1$ is consistent for $J := \operatorname{supp}(\Delta\mu)$ under the stated conditions. The same arguments apply to proving the consistency of $\hat{J}_2$ and details are therefore omitted.

We first observe that the number of false positives goes to zero in probability. Indeed,

$$\mathbb{E}\,|\hat{J}_1 \setminus J| = \sum_{j\notin J} \mathbb{P}\left[j \in \hat{J}_1\right] \leq p\,\mathbb{P}_0\left[T_{1,j} > q_1^{-1}(\alpha/p)\right] = \alpha = o(1) .$$

And, by Markov's inequality, this implies that that $|\hat{J}_1 \setminus J| \to 0$ in probability.

It remains to prove that $|J \setminus \hat{J}_1| = o_P(|J|)$. First, take $j \notin J$. Using the arguments in Section 7.4.1 for the case $s = 1$, or directly using concentration bounds for the numerator and denominator defining $T_1^{(j)}$, we can see that

$$\mathbb{P}\left[T_1^{(j)} > \frac{n\sqrt{2/\pi} + \sqrt{n}t}{\sqrt{1-t/\sqrt{n}}}\right] \leq Ce^{-t^2/C} ,$$

for some universal constant $C > 0$. Hence,

$$b \geq Ce^{-t^2/C} \Rightarrow q_1^{-1}(b) \leq \frac{n\sqrt{2/\pi} + \sqrt{n}t}{\sqrt{1-t/\sqrt{n}}} .$$

In particular, when $\alpha \geq p^{-a}$ for some $a > 0$ fixed,

$$q_1^{-1}(\alpha/p) \leq q_1^{-1}(p^{-a-1}) \leq n\sqrt{2/\pi} + Cn\sqrt{\frac{\log(p)}{n}} \ ,$$

for a different constant $C > 0$.

Since the effective dynamic range of $\Delta\mu$ and the s-sparse Riesz constant of $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ are both bounded, Condition (54) implies that

$$\min_{j \in J} \frac{(\Delta\mu_j)^2}{\sigma_{jj}} \gg \left[\frac{\log(p)}{n}\right]^{1/4} \ .$$

Then exactly as in Section 7.4.2, in the simplest case where $s = 1$, we find that, for any $j \in J$, $\frac{1}{n}T_1^{(j)} - \sqrt{2\pi} \gg \sqrt{\frac{\log(p)}{n}}$, where the inequality follows from assumption on ν. (Recall that ν is fixed.) This implies that $\mathbb{P}[j \notin \hat{J}_1] = o(1)$ uniformly in $j \in J$. Then

$$\mathbb{E}\,|J \setminus \hat{J}_1| = \sum_{j \in J} \mathbb{P}\left[j \notin \hat{J}_1\right] = o(|J|) \ .$$

And we conclude by Markov's inequality.

7.10 Proof of deviation inequalities

7.10.1 Proof of Lemma 9

The first bound is a consequence of Chebyshev inequality. Thus, we focus on (100).

$$Q_4^\circ(v) - Q_4^\circ(w) = \frac{1}{2}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n ((v-w)^\top Z_i)^4((v+w)^\top Z_i) + ((v-w)^\top Z_i)((v+w)^\top Z_i)^3\right] \ .$$

Since v and w are unit vectors, $(v-w)^\top Z_i$ and $(v+w)^\top Z_i$ follow independent distributions. Define A_i, $i = 1, \dots n$ and B_i, $i = 1, \dots, n$ $2n$ independent standard normal variables. Then, $2(Q_4^\circ(v) - Q_4^\circ(w))$ follows the same distribution as $\|v-w\|^3\|v+w\| \sum_{i=1}^n A_i^3 B_i + \|v-w\|\|v+w\|^3 \sum_{i=1}^n A_i B_i^3$. Consequently, the proofs boil down to controlling random variables of the form $T := \sum_{i=1}^n A_i B_i^3$. Conditionally to A_i, T is a weighted Gaussian chaos of degree 3. Applying Lemma 12, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\left[|T| \geq C_1\|A\|(\sqrt{x}+1) + C_2\|A\|_\infty\sqrt{\log(n)}x + C_3\|A\|_\infty x^{3/2}\right] \leq 2e^{-x} \ ,$$

for any $x > 0$. Since $\|A\|^2$ follows a χ^2 distribution and $\|A\|_\infty$ is a supremum of n Gaussian variables, we use Lemma 6 to obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\|A\|^2 \geq n + 2\sqrt{nx} + 2x\right] \leq e^{-x} \qquad \mathbb{P}\left[\|A\|_\infty \geq \sqrt{2(\log(2n) + x)}\right] \leq e^{-x} \ .$$

Reorganizing all the terms leads to

$$\mathbb{P}\left[|T| \geq C_1\sqrt{n(x \vee 1)} + C_2 x^2\right] \leq 4e^{-x} \ .$$

Then, (100) follows from the inequality $\|v+w\| \leq 2$ (since v and w are unit vectors).

7.10.2 Proof of Lemma 10

Fix $v, w \in \mathcal{V}$. For any $\lambda > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\lambda(Q_1^\circ(v)-Q_1^\circ(w))}\right] = \left(\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\lambda(|v^\top Z|-|w^\top Z|)}\right]\right)^n ,$$

where Z is standard normal. Decompose w into $w = av + \sqrt{1-a^2}w_0$ where $a \in (-1,1)$ and $w_0 \perp v$, and define $X = v^\top Z$ and $Y = w_0^\top Z$. Notice that X and Y are iid standard normal variables. We then apply Lemma 14 below to get

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\lambda(Q_1^\circ(v)-Q_1^\circ(w))}\right] \leq \exp\left[2n\lambda^2\|v-w\|^2\right] ,$$

and conclude the proof of Lemma 10 by a simple application of Chernoff's bound.

Lemma 14. *Consider X and Y two independent standard normal variables. For any $a \in (-1,1)$ and $\lambda > 0$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\lambda(|X|-|aX+\sqrt{1-a^2}Y|)}\right] \leq e^{4\lambda^2(1-a)} .$$

Proof. Let $b = \sqrt{1-a^2}$. Using a power series expansion, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\lambda(|X|-|aX+bY|)}\right] = 1 + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^k}{k!}\,\mathbb{E}\left[(|X|-|aX+bY|)^k\right] ,$$

since $|X|$ and $|aX+bY|$ have the same expectation. Define $\delta = \sqrt{(1-a)^2+b^2} = \sqrt{2-2a}$. For the term of order k, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[(|X|-|aX+bY|)^k\right] &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[|(1-a)X+bY|^k\right] = \delta^k\,\mathbb{E}[|X|^k] \\
&= \delta^k \frac{2^{k/2}\Gamma(\frac{k+1}{2})}{\sqrt{\pi}} \\
&\leq \delta^k\left[\left(\frac{k-1}{\sqrt{2}}\,\mathbb{E}[|X|^{k-1}]\right) \wedge \mathbb{E}[|X|^{k+1}]\right] .
\end{aligned}$$

As a consequence,

$$\frac{\lambda^{2k+1}\delta^{2k+1}\,\mathbb{E}\left[|X|^{2k+1}\right]}{(2k+1)!} \leq \lambda^{2k}\delta^{2k}\frac{\mathbb{E}[X^{2k}]}{2k!} + \lambda^{2k+2}\delta^{2k+2}(2k+2)\frac{\mathbb{E}[X^{2k+2}]}{(2k+2)!} .$$

Coming back to the exponential moment, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\lambda(|X|-|aX+bY|)}\right] &\leq 1 + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty}\frac{\lambda^k}{k!}\delta^k\,\mathbb{E}[|X|^k] \\
&\leq 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{\lambda^{2k}}{(2k)!}\delta^{2k}\,\mathbb{E}[X^{2k}] + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{\lambda^{2k+1}}{(2k+1)!}\delta^{2k+1}\,\mathbb{E}[|X|^{2k+1}] \\
&\leq 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{\lambda^{2k}}{(2k)!}\delta^{2k}(2k+2)\,\mathbb{E}\left[X^{2k}\right] \\
&\leq 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}(2\lambda\delta)^{2k}\frac{\mathbb{E}\left[X^{2k}\right]}{(2k)!} = \mathbb{E}\left[e^{2\lambda\delta X}\right] \\
&\leq \exp\left[2\lambda^2\delta^2\right] .
\end{aligned}$$

□

7.10.3 Proof of Lemma 11

Denote Υ_{2s} the $(2s)$-sparse Riesz constant of $\mathbf{\Sigma}$. We prove the subgaussian deviation bounds using the Laplace transform. For $\lambda > 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_\eta \left[\exp\left\{\lambda(R_{u_1,\eta} - R_{u_2,\eta})\right\} \right] = \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\eta_i}\left[e^{\lambda T_i}\right] \ ,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} T_i &:= |v_{u_1}^\top Z_i - (\eta_i - \nu) t_{v_{u_2}}| - |{v_{u_2}}^\top Z_i - (\eta_i - \nu) t_{u_2}| - \mathbb{E}_{\eta_i}\left[|v_{u_1}^\top Z_i - (\eta_i - \nu) t_{u_1}|\right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_{\eta_i}\left[|v_{u_2}^\top Z_i - (\eta_i - \nu) t_{u_2}|\right] \ . \end{aligned}$$

Using the Taylor expansion of the exponential function, we get $\mathbb{E}_{\eta_i}\left[e^{\lambda T_i}\right] = 1 + \sum_{k=2}^\infty \frac{\lambda^k}{k!}\mathbb{E}_{\eta_i}\left[T_i^k\right]$. Note that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\eta_i}\left[|v_{u_1}^\top Z_i - (\eta_i - \nu) t_{u_1}|\right] - \mathbb{E}_{\eta_i}\left[|v_{u_2}^\top Z_i - (\eta_i - \nu) t_{u_2}|\right] | \le |\eta_i - \nu||t_{u_2} - t_{u_1}| \ .$$

Since u_1 and u_2 are in $\mathcal{U}_\delta$, $\|v_{u_1} - v_{u_2}\| \le 2\Upsilon_{2s}^{1/2}\|u_1 - u_2\|$. Similarly, $\|t_{u_1} - t_{u_2}\| \le 2\Upsilon_{2s}\|u_1 - u_2\| t_\star$. Combining these bounds, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\eta_i}\left[T_i^k\right] &\le \mathbb{E}_{\eta_i}\left[|T_i|^k\right] \\ &\le \mathbb{E}_{\eta_i}\left[\left(\left|(v_{u_1} - v_{u_2})^\top Z_i\right| + 2|\eta_i - \nu||t_{u_1} - t_{u_2}|\right)^k\right] \\ &\le 2^{2k-1}|\eta_i - \nu|^k |t_{u_1} - t_{u_2}|^k + 2^{k-1}\,\mathbb{E}\left[\left|(v_{u_1} - v_{u_2})^\top Z_i\right|^k\right] \\ &\le 2^{2k-1}2^k \Upsilon_{2s}^k \|u_1 - u_2\|^k t_\star^k + 2^{k-1}2^k \Upsilon_{2s}^{k/2}\,\mathbb{E}\left[\left|(u_1 - u_2)^\top Z_i\right|^k\right] \ . \end{aligned}$$

We have already bounded $\mathbb{E}\left[\left|(u_1 - u_2)^\top Z_i\right|^k\right]$ in the proof of Lemma 14. Arguing as in this last proof, we upper bound each term of the Taylor expansion to get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\eta_i}\left[e^{\lambda T_i}\right] &\le -1 + \exp\left[C\lambda^2 \Upsilon_{2s}^2 \|u_1 - u_2\|^2 t_\star^2\right] + \exp\left[C\lambda^2 \Upsilon_{2s}\|u_1 - u_2\|^2\right] \\ &\le \exp\left[C\lambda^2 \|u_1 - u_2\|^2\right] \ , \end{aligned}$$

since we assume that $t_\star = o(1)$ and $\Upsilon_{2s} = O(1)$. We conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}_\eta \left[\exp\left\{\lambda(R_{u_1,\eta} - R_{u_2,\eta})\right\} \right] \le \exp\left[Cn\lambda^2 \|u_1 - u_2\|^2\right] \ .$$

Since this is true uniformly over η, it is true unconditionally, and an application of Chernoff's bound yields the desired result.

7.10.4 Proof of Lemma 12

Proof of (125). We rely on the concentration bounds developed by Boucheron et al. (2005) for Rademacher chaoses. Here n is fixed and we define a sequence of iid Rademacher random variables $(Y_{i,k} : i = 1, \dots, n; k \ge 1)$. Then, as $N \to \infty$,

$$T := \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \Big(\sum_{j=1}^N \frac{Y_{i,k}}{N^{1/2}} \Big)^3$$

converges in distribution towards $T^* := \sum_{i=1}^n a_i (v^\top Z_i)^3$, and any moment of T converges to that of T^*. Developing T, we get $T = T_1 + T_2 + T_3$, where

$$\begin{aligned} T_1 &:= \frac{6}{N^{3/2}} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \sum_{1 \le j_1 < j_2 < j_3 \le N} Y_{i,j_1} Y_{i,j_2} Y_{i,j_2} \ , \\ T_2 &:= \frac{3}{N^{3/2}} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \sum_{1 \le j \ne k \le N} Y_{i,j} Y_{i,k}^2 = \frac{3(N-1)}{N^{3/2}} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \sum_{1 \le j \le N} Y_{i,j} \ , \\ T_3 &:= \frac{1}{N^{3/2}} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \sum_{1 \le j \le N} Y_{i,j}^3 = \frac{1}{N^{3/2}} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \sum_{1 \le j \le N} Y_{i,j} \ . \end{aligned}$$

Recall that n is fixed here, while $N \to \infty$. Hence, by Chebyshev's inequality, $T_3 = o_P(1)$, that is, converges to zero in probability as $N \to \infty$. Consequently, for any fixed $x_1, x_2 > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[|T^*| \ge x_1 + x_2\right] \le \limsup \mathbb{P}\left[|T_1| \ge x_1\right] + \limsup \mathbb{P}\left[|T_2| \ge x_2\right] \ , \tag{137}$$

where the limit superior is w.r.t. $N \to \infty$. Observe that T_2 converges in distribution towards $\mathcal{N}(0, 9\|a\|^2)$. Hence, $\limsup \mathbb{P}\left[|T_2| \ge x_2\right] \le 2e^{-x_2^2/(18\|a\|^2)}$. We focus on the deviations of T_1, which is a Rademacher chaos of order 3. First, by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, $\mathbb{E}(|T_1|) \le C\|a\|$. For any positive integers k and ℓ, let $\mathbb{B}_{k\times\ell}$ denote the unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^{k\times\ell}$ for the Euclidean metric. By (Boucheron et al., 2005, Cor. 4), for any $t > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[|T_1| \ge \mathbb{E}(|T_1|) + t\right] \le \exp\left[-C \bigwedge_{\ell=1}^3 \left(\frac{t}{\mathbb{E}[W_\ell]}\right)^{2/\ell}\right] \ , \tag{138}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} W_1 &= \sup_{\alpha \in \mathbb{B}_{n\times N}} 3\Big| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \sum_{j_1} \sum_{j_2 \ne j_1} \sum_{j_3 \notin \{j_1, j_2\}} \frac{Y_{i,j_1} Y_{i,j_2} \alpha_{i,j_3}}{N^{3/2}} \Big| \ , \\ W_2 &= \sup_{\alpha^{(1)}, \alpha^{(2)} \in \mathbb{B}_{n\times N}} 3\Big| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \sum_{j_1} \sum_{j_2 \ne j_1} \sum_{j_3 \notin \{j_1, j_2\}} \frac{Y_{i,j_1} \alpha^{(1)}_{i,j_2} \alpha^{(2)}_{i,j_3}}{N^{3/2}} \Big| \ , \\ W_3 &= \sup_{\alpha^{(1)}, \alpha^{(2)}, \alpha^{(3)} \in \mathbb{B}_{n\times N}} \Big| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \sum_{j_1} \sum_{j_2 \ne j_1} \sum_{j_3 \notin \{j_1, j_2\}} \frac{\alpha^{(1)}_{i,j_1} \alpha^{(2)}_{i,j_2} \alpha^{(3)}_{i,j_3}}{N^{3/2}} \Big| \ . \end{aligned}$$

We now bound the expectation of these three random variables. For W_1, we have

$$W_1 \le 3V_1 + 3U_1 \ ,$$

where

$$V_1 := \sup_{\alpha \in \mathbb{B}_{n\times N}} \Big| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \sum_{j_1} \sum_{j_2 \ne j_1} \frac{Y_{i,j_1} Y_{i,j_2}}{N^{3/2}} \sum_{j_3=1}^N \alpha_{i,j_3} \Big| \ ,$$

and

$$U_1 := \sup_{\alpha \in \mathbb{B}_{n\times N}} \Big| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \sum_{j_1} \sum_{j_2 \ne j_1} \frac{Y_{i,j_1} Y_{i,j_2} (\alpha_{i,j_1} + \alpha_{i,j_2})}{N^{3/2}} \Big| \ .$$

Applying the triangle and Cauchy-Schwarz inequalities, we have

$$U_1 \le 2\sum_{i=1}^n |a_i| H_i^{1/2}, \quad \text{where} \quad H_i := \sum_{j_1} \frac{Y_{i,j_1}^2}{N^3}\Big(\sum_{j_2\neq j_1} Y_{i,j_2}\Big)^2 = N^{-3}\sum_{j_1}\Big(\sum_{j_2\neq j_1} Y_{i,j_2}\Big)^2 .$$

Note that $0 \le H_i \le 1$ and $\mathbb{E}(H_i) = (N-1)/N^2 = o(1)$, so that $\mathbb{E}(U_1^m) = o(1)$ for any fixed $m \ge 1$.

For V_1, letting $\tilde\alpha_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt N}\sum_j \alpha_{i,j}$, and realizing that $\alpha \in \mathbb{B}_{n\times N}$ implies that $\tilde\alpha \in \mathbb{B}_n := \mathbb{B}_{n\times 1}$ by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$V_1 \;\le\; \sup_{\tilde\alpha\in\mathbb{B}_n}\Big|\sum_{i=1}^n a_i\tilde\alpha_i \sum_{j_1}\sum_{j_2\neq j_1}\frac{Y_{i,j_1}Y_{i,j_2}}{N}\Big| = \left[\sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2\Big(\sum_{j_1}\sum_{j_2\neq j_1}\frac{Y_{i,j_1}Y_{i,j_2}}{N}\Big)^2\right]^{1/2}$$

where we applied Cauchy-Schwarz inequality in the second line. The last term has second moment bounded by $C\|a\|^2$, and therefore first moment bounded by $C\|a\|$ by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. We conclude that $\limsup \mathbb{E}[W_1] \le C\|a\|$.

We proceed similarly for W_2, starting from

$$W_2 \le 3V_2 + 3U_2 \ ,$$

where

$$V_2 := \sup_{\alpha^{(1)},\alpha^{(2)}\in\mathbb{B}_{n\times N}}\Big|\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \sum_{j_1,j_2,j_3}\frac{Y_{i,j_1}\alpha^{(1)}_{i,j_2}\alpha^{(2)}_{i,j_3}}{N^{3/2}}\Big| \ ,$$

and

$$U_2 := \sup_{\alpha^{(1)},\alpha^{(2)}\in\mathbb{B}_{n\times N}} 2\Big|\sum_{i=1}^n a_i\sum_{j_1}\sum_{j_2\neq j_1}\frac{Y_{i,j_1}\alpha^{(1)}_{i,j_1}\alpha^{(2)}_{i,j_2}}{N^{3/2}}\Big| + \Big|\sum_{i=1}^n a_i\sum_{j_1}\sum_{j_2}\frac{Y_{i,j_1}\alpha^{(1)}_{i,j_2}\alpha^{(2)}_{i,j_2}}{N^{3/2}}\Big| \ .$$

By the triangle inequality, and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality multiple times,

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|\sum_{i=1}^n a_i\sum_{j_1}\sum_{j_2\neq j_1}\frac{Y_{i,j_1}\alpha^{(1)}_{i,j_1}\alpha^{(2)}_{i,j_2}}{N^{3/2}}\Big| &\le N^{-3/2}\sum_{i=1}^n |a_i|\Big[\sum_{j_1} Y_{i,j_1}^2 {\alpha^{(1)}_{i,j_1}}^2\Big]^{1/2}\Big[\sum_{j_1}\Big(\sum_{j_2\neq j_1}\alpha^{(2)}_{i,j_2}\Big)^2\Big]^{1/2}\\ &\le N^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n |a_i| = o(1) \ ,\end{aligned}$$

using the fact that $\alpha^{(1)}, \alpha^{(2)} \in \mathbb{B}_{n\times N}$. Similarly,

$$\Big|\sum_{i=1}^n a_i\sum_{j_1}\sum_{j_2}\frac{Y_{i,j_1}\alpha^{(1)}_{i,j_2}\alpha^{(2)}_{i,j_2}}{N^{3/2}}\Big| \le \Big|\sum_{i=1}^n a_i\sum_{j_2}\frac{|\alpha^{(1)}_{i,j_2}\alpha^{(2)}_{i,j_2}|}{N^{1/2}}\Big| \le N^{1/2}\sum_{i=1}^n |a_i| = o(1)$$

For V_2, as for V_1 (and using similar notation), we have

$$\begin{aligned}V_2 &\le \sup_{\tilde\alpha^{(1)},\tilde\alpha^{(2)}\in\mathbb{B}_n}\Big|\sum_{i=1}^n a_i\tilde\alpha^{(1)}_i\tilde\alpha^{(2)}_i H_i\Big|\\ &= \sup_{\tilde\alpha^{(1)}\in\mathbb{B}_n}\Big[\sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2 H_i^2(\tilde\alpha^{(1)}_i)^2\Big]^{1/2} = \bigvee_{i=1}^n |a_i H_i| \ ,\end{aligned}$$

where $H_i := \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_j Y_{i,j}$, and we used the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality multiple times. By the convergence of moments in the central limit theorem (von Bahr, 1965, Th. 1), W_2 is upper bounded by a variable converging in moment to $\|a\|_\infty$ times the supremum of n independent standard normal distributions. We obtain $\limsup \mathbb{E}[W_2] \leq C\|a\|_\infty \sqrt{\log(n)}$.

We work on W_3 in a similarly way. Applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality multiple times, and reasoning as we did before, we have

$$\begin{aligned} W_3 &\leq \sup_{\alpha^{(1)},\alpha^{(2)},\alpha^{(3)} \in \mathbb{B}_{n\times N}} \Big| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \sum_{j_1,j_2,j_3} \frac{\alpha^{(1)}_{i,j_1} \alpha^{(2)}_{i,j_2} \alpha^{(3)}_{i,j_3}}{N^{3/2}} \Big| + o(1) \\ &\leq \sup_{\tilde\alpha^{(1)},\tilde\alpha^{(2)},\tilde\alpha^{(3)} \in \mathbb{B}_{n}} \Big| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \tilde\alpha^{(1)}_i \tilde\alpha^{(2)}_i \tilde\alpha^{(3)}_i \Big| + o(1) \\ &\leq \sup_{\alpha^{(1)},\alpha^{(2)} \in \mathbb{B}_{n}} \Big[\sum_{i=1}^n \Big(a_i \alpha^{(1)}_i \alpha^{(2)}_i \Big)^2 \Big]^{1/2} + o(1) \leq \|a\|_\infty + o(1) \ . \end{aligned}$$

We conclude the proof of (125) by combining (137) and (138) with the above bound.

Proof of (126). This simply follows from the observation that $\sqrt{\log(n)} x \leq \sqrt{nx} + x^{3/2}$ is valid for all $x \geq 0$ and all $n \geq 1$.

Proof of (127). Fix two any unit vectors v and w. We have

$$Q_3^\circ(v) - Q_3^\circ(w) = \frac{1}{4} U_1 + \frac{3}{4} U_2 \ , \tag{139}$$

where

$$U_1 := \sum_{i=1}^n [(v-w)^\top Z_i]^3 \ , \quad U_2 := \sum_{i=1}^n [(v-w)^\top Z_i][(v+w)^\top Z_i]^2 \ .$$

As a consequence, $U_1/\|v-w\|^3$ follows the same distribion as $Q_3^\circ(v)$ and we can control its deviations using (125). Since $(v-w)^\top Z_i$ is independent of $(v+w)^\top Z_i$, $U_2/[\|v-w\|\|v+w\|^2]$ follows the same distribution as

$$U := \sum_{i=1}^n A_i B_i^2 \ ,$$

where $A_1, \ldots, A_n, B_1, \ldots, B_n$ are iid standard normal. Observe that U is a quadratic function with respect to B. Relying on a straightforward extension of (Laurent and Massart, 2000, Lem. 1) that provides a deviation bound for non-necessarily positive quadratic forms of Gaussian random variables, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left[U \geq \sum_{i=1}^n A_i + 2\Big(x \sum_i^n A_i^2 \Big)^{1/2} + 2x\|A\|_\infty \right] \leq e^{-x}$$

for any $x > 0$. Classical deviation inequalities for Gaussian distributions, χ^2 distributions and suprema of Gaussian vectors lead to

$$\mathbb{P}\Big[\sum_{i=1}^n A_i \geq \sqrt{2nx} \Big] \leq e^{-x} \ , \quad \mathbb{P}\Big[\sum_i^n A_i^2 \geq n + 2\sqrt{nx} + 2x \Big] \leq e^{-x}$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\|A\|_\infty \geq \sqrt{2(\log(2n)+x)}\right] \leq e^{-x} \ , \quad \forall x>0.$$

Gathering these four deviation inequalities, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\left[U \geq C_1\sqrt{nx} + C_2\sqrt{\log(n)}x\right] \leq 4e^{-x} \ , \quad \forall x>0.$$

Since v and w are unit vector, $\|v+w\| \leq 2$. Coming back to (139) and combining the previous deviation inequality with (125), we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\left[Q_3^\circ(v) - Q_3^\circ(w) \geq \|v-w\|\left(C_1\sqrt{n}(\sqrt{x}+1) + C_2\sqrt{\log(n)}x + C_3x^{3/2}\right)\right] \leq 6e^{-x} \ ,$$

for any $x>0$.

7.10.5 Proof of Lemma 13

Let X be a standard normal variable. For any $\lambda \in (-1/2, 1/2)$,

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp(\lambda X^2 \operatorname{sign}(X))] = \frac{1}{2}(1-2\lambda)^{-1/2} + \frac{1}{2}(1+2\lambda)^{-1/2} \ .$$

Computing the Taylor expansion of this expression leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
\log\left(\mathbb{E}[\exp(\lambda X^2 \operatorname{sign}(X))]\right) &= \log\left(1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^{2k}(4k-1)!!}{(2k)!}\right) \\
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^{2k}(4k-1)!!}{(2k)!} \\
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^{2k-1}\lambda^{2k} \leq \frac{2\lambda^2}{1-2\lambda} \ ,
\end{aligned}$$

where, we compare the power series in the last line. Thus, for any $\lambda \in (0, 1/2)$,

$$\log(\mathbb{E}[\exp[\lambda Q_2^{\mathrm{sign},\circ}(v)]]) \leq \frac{2n\lambda^2}{1-2\lambda} \ .$$

We now refer the reader to (Birgé and Massart, 1998), where it is proved that such a bound implies that, for any $t>0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[Q_2^{\mathrm{sign},\circ}(v) \geq \sqrt{8nt} + 2t\right] \leq e^{-t} \ .$$

Consider X and Y two independent standard normal variables. Let $a \in [0,1)$ and $b = \sqrt{1-a^2}$. We compute the generating function of $Z := X^2\operatorname{sign}(X) - (aX+bY)^2\operatorname{sign}(aX+bY)$. Using a power series expansion, we get

$$\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\lambda Z}\right] = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^{2k}}{(2k)!}\mathbb{E}\left[(X^2\operatorname{sign}(X) - (aX+bY)^2\operatorname{sign}(aX+bY))^{2k}\right] \ ,$$

by symmetry about 0. Decompose the $2k$-th moment into a sum of two terms

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[(X^2\operatorname{sign}(X) - (aX+bY)^2\operatorname{sign}(aX+bY))^{2k}\right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}\left[(X^2 - (aX+bY)^2)^{2k}\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[(X^2 + (aX+bY)^2)^{2k}\mathbb{1}_{\{\operatorname{sign}(X)\neq\operatorname{sign}(aX+bY)\}}\right] \\
&=: A_1 + A_2 \ .
\end{aligned}$$

Since $X^2-(aX+bY)^2=[(1-a)X-bY][(1+a)X+bY]$ is the product of two independent normal variables with zero mean and variance $(1-a)^2+b^2=2(1-a)$ and $2(1+a)$, respectively, we obtain

$$A_1=(1-a^2)^k 2^{2k}[(2k-1)!!]^2 \ .$$

Turning to A_2, when $\mathbb{1}_{\{\mathrm{sign}(X)\neq\mathrm{sign}(aX+bY)\}}=1$ we have

$$X^2+(aX+bY)^2=(1-a^2)X^2+b^2Y^2+2aX(aX+bY)\leq(1-a^2)X^2+b^2Y^2=(1-a^2)(X^2+Y^2) \ .$$

Hence, we obtain

$$A_2 \ \leq \ \mathbb{E}\left[((1-a^2)(X^2+Y^2))^{2k}\right]=(1-a^2)^{2k}(4k)!!\leq(1-a^2)^k 2^{2k}(2k)! \ ,$$

using the fact that $X^2+Y^2\sim\chi^2_2$ and the moments of this distribution. Coming back to the moment generating function, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\log\left(\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\lambda Z}\right]\right) &\leq \log\left[1+\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\left(\sqrt{1-a^2}\lambda\right)^{2k}\frac{2^{2k}[(2k-1)!!]^2+2^{2k}(2k)!}{(2k)!}\right] \\
&\leq \log\left[1+\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}2\left(2\sqrt{1-a^2}\lambda\right)^{2k}\right] \\
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}2\left(2\sqrt{1-a^2}\lambda\right)^{2k} \\
&\leq \frac{8(1-a^2)\lambda^2}{1-2\sqrt{1-a^2}\lambda} \ ,
\end{aligned}$$

if $0<\lambda<(2\sqrt{1-a^2})^{-1}$. Applying this bound to $Q_2^{\mathrm{sign},\circ}(v)-Q_2^{\mathrm{sign},\circ}(w)$, with $a=v^\top w$ assumed to be nonnegative, yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\log\left(\mathbb{E}\left[e^{\lambda(Q_2^{\mathrm{sign},\circ}(v)-Q_2^{\mathrm{sign},\circ}(w))}\right]\right) &\leq \frac{8n(1-a^2)\lambda^2}{1-2\sqrt{1-a^2}\lambda} \\
&\leq \frac{8n\|v-w\|^2\lambda^2}{1-2\|v-w\|\lambda} \ ,
\end{aligned}$$

using the fact that $\|v\|=\|w\|=1$. We use (Birgé and Massart, 1998) again, where this bound is shown to entail that, for any $t>0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[Q_2^{\mathrm{sign},\circ}(v)-Q_2^{\mathrm{sign},\circ}(w)\geq 4\|v-w\|\sqrt{nt}+2\|v-w\|t\right]\leq e^{-t} \ .$$

Acknowledgements

This work was partially supported by the US Office of Naval Research (N00014-13-1-0257) and the French Agence Nationale de la Recherche (ANR 2011 BS01 010 01 projet Calibration).

References

Akaike, H. (1974). A new look at the statistical model identification. *IEEE Trans. Automatic Control AC-19*, 716–723. System identification and time-series analysis.

Aldous, D. J. (1985). *Exchangeability and related topics, École d'été de probabilités de Saint Flour XIII*, Volume **1117** of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.

Amini, A. A. and M. J. Wainwright (2009). High-dimensional analysis of semidefinite relaxations for sparse principal components. *The Annals of Statistics 37*(5B), 2877–2921.

Azizyan, M., A. Singh, and L. Wasserman (2013). Minimax theory for high-dimensional gaussian mixtures with sparse mean separation. *Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*.

Azizyan, M., A. Singh, and L. Wasserman (2014). Efficient sparse clustering of high-dimensional non-spherical gaussian mixtures. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1406.2206*.

Belkin, M. and K. Sinha (2010). Polynomial learning of distribution families. In *Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), 2010 51st Annual IEEE Symposium on*, pp. 103–112. IEEE.

Berthet, Q. and P. Rigollet (2013a). Complexity theoretic lower bounds for sparse principal component detection. In *Conference on Learning Theory (COLT)*, pp. 1046–1066.

Berthet, Q. and P. Rigollet (2013b). Optimal detection of sparse principal components in high dimension. *The Annals of Statistics 41*(4), 1780–1815.

Bickel, P. J. and E. Levina (2004). Some theory of Fisher's linear discriminant function, 'naive Bayes', and some alternatives when there are many more variables than observations. *Bernoulli 10*(6), 989–1010.

Birgé, L. (2001). An alternative point of view on Lepski's method. In *State of the art in probability and statistics (Leiden, 1999)*, Volume 36 of *IMS Lecture Notes Monogr. Ser.*, pp. 113–133. Beachwood, OH: Inst. Math. Statist.

Birgé, L. and P. Massart (1998). Minimum contrast estimators on sieves: exponential bounds and rates of convergence. *Bernoulli 4*(3), 329–375.

Birnbaum, A., I. M. Johnstone, B. Nadler, and D. Paul (2013). Minimax bounds for sparse pca with noisy high-dimensional data. *The Annals of Statistics 41*(3), 1055–1084.

Boucheron, S., O. Bousquet, G. Lugosi, and P. Massart (2005). Moment inequalities for functions of independent random variables. *Ann. Probab. 33*(2), 514–560.

Brubaker, S. C. and S. S. Vempala (2008). Isotropic pca and affine-invariant clustering. In *Building Bridges*, pp. 241–281. Springer.

Cai, T., Z. Ma, and Y. Wu (2013a). Optimal estimation and rank detection for sparse spiked covariance matrices. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 1–35.

Cai, T. T., Z. Ma, and Y. Wu (2013b). Sparse PCA: Optimal rates and adaptive estimation. *The Annals of Statistics 41*(6), 3074–3110.

Candès, E. and T. Tao (2005). The Dantzig selector: Statistical estimation when p is much larger than n. *Annals of Statistics 35*(6), 2313–2351.

Chan, Y. and P. Hall (2010). Using evidence of mixed populations to select variables for clustering very high-dimensional data. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc. 105*(490), 798–809.

Chang, W.-C. (1983). On using principal components before separating a mixture of two multivariate normal distributions. *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. C 32*, 267—275.

Chaudhuri, K., S. Dasgupta, and A. Vattani (2009). Learning mixtures of gaussians using the k-means algorithm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:0912.0086*.

Chen, S. S., D. L. Donoho, and M. A. Saunders (1998). Atomic decomposition by basis pursuit. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput. 20*(1), 33–61 (electronic).

d'Aspremont, A., L. El Ghaoui, M. I. Jordan, and G. R. G. Lanckriet (2007). A direct formulation for sparse pca using semidefinite programming. *SIAM Review 49*(3), 434–448.

Davidson, K. R. and S. J. Szarek (2001). Local operator theory, random matrices and Banach spaces. In *Handbook of the geometry of Banach spaces, Vol. I*, pp. 317–366. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Donoho, D. and J. Jin (2009). Feature selection by higher criticism thresholding achieves the

optimal phase diagram. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci. 367*(1906), 4449–4470. With electronic supplementary materials available online.

Fan, J. and H. Peng (2004). Nonconcave penalized likelihood with a diverging number of parameters. *Ann. Statist. 32*(3), 928–961.

Friedman, J. and J. Meulman (2004). Clustering objects on subsets of attributes. *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B 66*, 815—849.

Hardt, M. and E. Price (2014, April). Tight bounds for learning a mixture of two gaussians. *ArXiv e-prints*.

Hastie, T., R. Tibshirani, and J. Friedman (2009). *The elements of statistical learning*. New York: Springer.

Hsu, D. and S. M. Kakade (2013). Learning mixtures of spherical gaussians: moment methods and spectral decompositions. In *Proceedings of the 4th conference on Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science*, pp. 11–20. ACM.

Ingster, Y. I., C. Pouet, and A. B. Tsybakov (2009). Classification of sparse high-dimensional vectors. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci. 367*(1906), 4427–4448.

Ji, P. and J. Jin (2012). UPS delivers optimal phase diagram in high-dimensional variable selection. *Ann. Statist. 40*(1), 73–103.

Jin, J. (2009). Impossibility of successful classification when useful features are rare and weak. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 106*(22), 8859–8864.

Jin, J. and W. Wang (2014). Important feature pca for high dimensional clustering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1407.5241*.

Johnstone, I. M. and A. Y. Lu (2009). On consistency and sparsity for principal components analysis in high dimensions. *Journal of the American Statistical Association 104*(486), 682–693.

Kalai, A. T., A. Moitra, and G. Valiant (2012). Disentangling gaussians. *Communications of the ACM 55*(2), 113–120.

Laurent, B. and P. Massart (2000). Adaptive estimation of a quadratic functional by model selection. *Ann. Statist. 28*(5), 1302–1338.

Ledoux, M. (1996). Isoperimetry and Gaussian analysis. In *Lectures on probability theory and statistics (Saint-Flour, 1994)*, Volume 1648 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pp. 165–294. Berlin: Springer.

Lehmann, E. L. and J. P. Romano (2005). *Testing statistical hypotheses* (Third ed.). Springer Texts in Statistics. New York: Springer.

Malkovich, J. F. and A. Afifi (1973). On tests for multivariate normality. *Journal of the American Statistical Association 68*(341), 176–179.

Mallat, S. and Z. Zhang (1993). Matching pursuit with time-frequency dictionaries. *IEEE Trans. Image Process. 41*, 3397–3415.

Mallows, C. (1973). Some comments on cp. *Technometrics 15*, 661–675.

Mardia, K. V. (1970). Measures of multivariate skewness and kurtosis with applications. *Biometrika 57*(3), 519–530.

Massart, P. (2007). *Concentration inequalities and model selection*, Volume 1896 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Berlin: Springer. Lectures from the 33rd Summer School on Probability Theory held in Saint-Flour, July 6–23, 2003, With a foreword by Jean Picard.

Maugis, C. and B. Michel (2011). A non asymptotic penalized criterion for Gaussian mixture model selection. *ESAIM Probab. Stat. 15*, 41–68.

Pan, W. and X. Shen (2007). Penalized model-based clustering with application to variable selection. *J. Mach. Learn. Res. 8*, 1145—1164.

Raftery, A. and N. Dean (2006). Variable selection for model-based clustering. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc. 101*, 168–178.

Schwarz, G. (1978). Estimating the dimension of a model. *Ann. Statist. 6*(2), 461–464.

Srivastava, M. S. (1984). A measure of skewness and kurtosis and a graphical method for assessing multivariate normality. *Statist. Probab. Lett. 2*(5), 263–267.

Tibshirani, R. (1996). Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B 58*(1), 267–288.

Tropp, J. A. (2004). Greed is good: algorithmic results for sparse approximation. *IEEE Trans. Info. Theory 50*(10), 2231–2242.

Tsybakov, A. B. (2009). *Introduction to nonparametric estimation*. Springer Series in Statistics. New York: Springer. Revised and extended from the 2004 French original, Translated by Vladimir Zaiats.

van der Vaart, A. W. and J. A. Wellner (1996). *Weak convergence and empirical processes*. Springer Series in Statistics. New York: Springer-Verlag. With applications to statistics.

Vershynin, R. (2010). Introduction to the non-asymptotic analysis of random matrices. Available from http://arxiv.org/abs/1011.3027.

Verzelen, N. (2012). Minimax risks for sparse regressions: Ultra-high dimensional phenomenons. *Electron. J. Stat. 6*, 38–90.

von Bahr, B. (1965). On the convergence of moments in the central limit theorem. *Ann. Math. Statist. 36*, 808–818.

Vu, V. Q. and J. Lei (2012). Minimax rates of estimation for sparse pca in high dimensions. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pp. 1278–1286.

Vu, V. Q. and J. Lei (2013). Minimax sparse principal subspace estimation in high dimensions. *The Annals of Statistics 41*(6), 2905–2947.

Wang, S. and J. Zhu (2008). Variable selection for model-based high- dimensional clustering and its application to microarray data. *Biometrics 64*, 440—448.

Witten, D. M. and R. Tibshirani (2010). A framework for feature selection in clustering. *Journal of the American Statistical Association 105*(490), 713–726.

Xie, B., W. Pan, and X. Shen (2008). Penalized model-based clusteringwith cluster-specific diagonal covariance matrices and grouped variables. *Electron. J. Stat. 2*, 168—212.

Zhu, J. and T. Hastie (2004). Classification of gene microarrays by penalized logistic regression. *Biostatistics 5*(2), 427–443.